

KAUA'I PLANNING COMMISSION
SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE MEETING
November 13, 2018

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 Lihu'e Civic Center, Mo'ikeha Building, in meeting room 2A-2B. The following Commissioners were present:

Mr. Roy Ho
Mr. Kimo Keawe
Mr. Sean Mahoney

The following staff members were present: Planning Department – Chance Bukoski and Dale Cua; Office of the County Attorney – Deputy County Attorney Jodi Higuchi Sayegusa; Office of Boards and Commissions – Commission Support Clerk Darcie Agaran

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Mr. Ho: I see we have an audience today, which is nice. Mr. Bukoski, will you start us with our roll call, please?

Mr. Bukoski: Thank you, Chair. Chair Ho.

Mr. Ho: Here.

Mr. Bukoski: Commissioner Mahoney.

Mr. Mahoney: Here.

Mr. Bukoski: Commissioner Keawe.

Mr. Keawe: Here.

Mr. Bukoski: We have three present.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

Mr. Keawe: Move to approve the agenda.

Mr. Mahoney: Second.

Mr. Ho: The motion on the floor is to approve the agenda. All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 3:0.

Mr. Bukoski: Thank you, Chair.

MINUTES of the meeting(s) of the Subdivision Committee

Meeting of October 9, 2018

Meeting of October 23, 2018

Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item D, Minutes of the Meeting of the Subdivision Committee – (No.) 1, Meeting of October 9, 2018, and also No. 2, Meeting of October 23, 2018.

Mr. Mahoney: Chair, move to approve the minutes of October 9, 2018, and October 23, 2018.

Mr. Keawe: Second.

Mr. Ho: The motion on the floor is to approve the minutes of our meetings – October 9th and October 23rd. All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 3:0.

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. Are there any individuals in the audience that would like to testify on any items on the agenda? Seeing none.

GENERAL BUSINESS MATTERS (For Action)

Stipulation Order to Void Final Subdivision Map Approval

Subdivision Application No. S-2006-04; BRYDESWOOD SUBDIVISION PHASE III;
Proposed 12-lot Subdivision; TMK: (4) 2-4-016:001 & 020-031; Kalāheo, Kaua‘i

Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item G, General Business Matters for Action. Stipulation order to revoke [sic] final subdivision map approval – Subdivision Application No. S-2006-04; Brydeswood Subdivision Phase III; proposed 12-lot subdivision; TMK: (4) 2-4-016 Parcels 001, and also Parcels 020 through 031; Kalāheo, Kaua‘i.

Commissioners, before I begin, I would like to note that I will be going over the (stipulation to) revoke the final subdivision approval, which is attached to Supplemental No. 1 before you.

In connection to Subdivision Application No. S-2006-04, the predecessor at that time was McBryde Sugar Company. Going through the subdivision process, they bonded and also executed a subdivision agreement, which was approved on September 28, 2010, toward the required infrastructure improvements. Later the next year, the subdivision received final map approval by the Planning Commission on February 8, 2011. After that, consequently, McBryde Sugar Company also had two extensions to complete the infrastructure improvements, which...the deadline for that was October 31, 2018. Also, congruent with the final subdivision map approval, McBryde Sugar Company also filed with the State Bureau of Conveyance to record the subdivision. Since that time, no sales of individual lots occurred since the final subdivision approval. Also, McBryde Sugar Company sold all of those properties to Sunset Strip Properties, LLC (“Sunset”). Sunset does not intend to commence or complete subdivision improvements on or before the completion date, which has since elapsed. Sunset does not intend to develop or sell any of the subdivided lots within the project area, and McBryde Sugar Company voluntarily filed a petition to the Planning Commission to revoke final subdivision map approval for the project.

Now, just to summarize everything, the reason behind this is since Sunset (Strip) Properties, LLC is the new owners of those properties and since the required infrastructure improvements were never built, this stipulation here is revoking the subdivision entirely and leaving it as is before it was the subdivision.

The recommendation from the Department is to approve this (stipulated) order to revoke the final subdivision of Subdivision Application No. S-2006-04.

Mr. Ho: Is there anyone in the audience representing...good morning, Mr. Jung.

Mr. Ian Jung: Good morning. Ian Jung on behalf of Sunset Strip Properties, LLC. This is a reboot of us making a second attempt at this. Thanks to Chance Bukoski for clarifying the matter. We did come before the Planning Commission and the Subdivision Committee last go around. We refined, with the County Attorney’s Office, the proposed stipulated order to revoke the subdivision now, so I think we are good on all those terms. Unless the Committee has any questions, I think we are ready to go.

Mr. Ho: Any discussion, Commissioners?

Mr. Keawe: I had one question, Jodi. So the stip is basically from the Planning Commission, so what is our procedure to...are we accepting and approving in form and then having the Planning Commission make the final approval?

Deputy County Attorney Jodi Higuchi Sayegusa: Yes, I think that would be the technical procedure. The stipulation was something both parties worked out together. It is an agreement between the parties. The Subdivision Committee could make a recommendation to revoke in accordance with the stipulation, and technically, at the full Commission meeting, it would be...by action of the Commission, it would be revoking at that point.

Mr. Ho: Am I clear to...we are going to receive the stip? Is that how I am going to do it, Jodi?

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: A motion to recommend approval of it.

Mr. Mahoney: Chair, may I?

Mr. Keawe: Go ahead.

Mr. Mahoney: In lieu of what happened before, like Attorney Jung just reminded us of it, it went through the Planning Department and our last Planning Commission, and an agreement was made. I think if both of the parties are satisfied and...what we are doing is if a motion passes through Committee, then it goes to the full Commission. So if that is where it stands, if there are no objections, Chair, I would make a motion to revoke Subdivision Application No. S-2006-04.

Mr. Keawe: Second.

Mr. Ho: Motion on the floor is to revoke Subdivision Application No. S-2006-04. All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 3:0.

Mr. Bukoski: Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Jung: Thank you.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS (For Action)

Tentative Subdivision Map Approval

Subdivision Application No. S-2019-2; *SUNSET STRIP PROPERTIES, LLC & MCBRYDE SUGAR COMPANY, LLC*; Proposed 12-lot Consolidation; TMK: (4) 2-4-016:001 & 020-031; Kalāheo, Kauaʻi

Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item H, Unfinished Business. Tentative subdivision map approval – S-2019-2; Sunset Strip Properties, LLC and McBryde Sugar Company, LLC; TMK: (4) 2-4-016 Parcel 001 and Parcels 020 through 031.

Now, Commissioners, I will not go into the Subdivision Report. Due to the previous conversation we had on the (stipulated) order to revoke the final subdivision map approval, this subdivision is apart...or, I would say, a layer on top of that subdivision, so therefore, since the (stipulated) order to revoke the final subdivision has been recommended and approved by the Subdivision Committee, it is no longer that this subdivision would be an action.

For this, from the Department's standpoint, the Department recommends that we amend the tentative subdivision map approval to null and void this subdivision application, S-2019-2.

Mr. Ho: Discussion? Mr. Keawe.

Mr. Keawe: So is that what we are doing? I thought we had to put the horse before the cart and the last time we did it backwards. We had already made that approval of the tentative subdivision map the last time, and because we couldn't do that without cancelling the subdivision, that is why we are doing it this time. So procedurally, Jodi, how do we proceed because we are looking at a tentative subdivision map approval, or basically the same thing that we did the last time?

Mr. Bukoski: I believe Subdivision Application No. S-2019-2 was deferred to this meeting, and then also S-2019-3 was approved and also, then, deferred during the regular meeting because of conflicting subdivision maps.

Mr. Mahoney: Doesn't the motion that was previously made have to be approved by the full Commission to be accepted?

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: Right. So technically, your previous action on Item G.1. acts as a recommendation to the full Commission, and the action and vote of the Commission will put into effect the revocation.

This item seems to be...there was a new subdivision application number with a recommendation by the Department, but the stipulation should have wrapped in these conditions that were recommended in this report under this subdivision application number.

Mr. Keawe: So is there any action needed on this, too? That's the bottom line.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: Maybe the attorney representative will be able to help further clarify.

Mr. Jung: I tried to chart the course on this thing, so I will take responsibility. So the approach, what we just did with what we call the Phase III subdivision, which was – let's call it the western subdivision – was the first of two parts of two subdivision actions. So this second part of the subdivision action – technically, what we are doing – because McBryde, through A&B, wanted to retain the two reservoir lots – we are taking this second subdivision and doing what Mr. Bukoski said, voiding out the subdivision agreements but allowing a new subdivision action to come in to consolidate all those lots into, what are going to be now, three lots. So the Phase III, which we just handled as a revocation, wipes those clean and reverts them back to its original status as the original parcel of record. This second, Phase II, subdivision action – we are actually

taking a number of lots – 12 lots – consolidating them in but leaving 3 total lots: 1 master lot and the 2 existing reservoir lots.

Mr. Keawe: Yes, the explanation I understand. The question is, do we...as the agenda listed, do we, subject to the vote, go ahead and make a motion to, based on the recommendation, approve the tentative subdivision map approval for this specific subdivision application number, S-2019-2?

Mr. Jung: I would agree with that approach.

Mr. Keawe: Okay. Jodi?

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: I think, in effect, that would be fine.

Mr. Keawe: That's all we are trying to get at; is how it is listed here, is that how we make the motion to approve?

Mr. Jung: The applicants would be fine with that approach.

Mr. Ho: Mr. Cua, it looks like you have a comment.

Mr. Cua: Just for clarification purposes and even for the Commissioners' knowledge, so essentially the stipulation would void Phase III of the subdivision.

Mr. Jung: But this one is Phase II, so we are consolidating the lots in Phase II.

Mr. Cua: Okay, so through the stipulation, if you were to eliminate those lots, these 12 lots technically doesn't exist, then.

Mr. Jung: Actually, no. Let me clarify for the Commission.

Mr. Cua: Yes, that's the question.

Mr. Jung: That specific question, with regard to the stipulation, is only to the Phase III subdivision action, which was that S-2006-04 subdivision number. This one trailed with a separate subdivision number and then now...so what the Planning Department is doing from the subdivision side is assigning a new number for the consolidation of those lots. So I think Phase III cancellation – we just handled that, Phase II – consolidation of the 12 lots into 3: 1 master lot and 2 reservoir lots. It is basically a new subdivision action over the old subdivision action.

Mr. Cua: Right. One comment, I guess. The Phase II subdivision – that was processed through Subdivision Application (No.) S-93-50, if I am correct.

Mr. Jung: Correct.

Mr. Cua: So we are eliminating the second subdivision application, which is S-2006-04, but we are still retaining S-93-50.

Mr. Jung: You are, but then you are consolidating those lots.

Mr. Cua: Okay, got it.

Mr. Jung: Just for a little back story on that – when my client purchased the property, there was no intent to maintain the subdivision and because, as Mr. Bukoski said, there were some trailing subdivision bonds and subdivision agreement, we got to clear the deck on those so then we can have a new subdivision action for the consolidation to revert those back, which doesn't trigger the infrastructure that the prior subdivision required.

Mr. Keawe: I get all of that. I just want to make sure that when we make the motion, it is proper and we don't have an issue with...so we will just follow what is on the agenda.

Mr. Cua: Yes.

Mr. Keawe: Got it.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: Yes.

Mr. Jung: Nothing's easy.

Mr. Mahoney: My point was that the previous motion doesn't have to be approved because technically it's not dissolved yet until the Commission votes on it, right? So does that affect this? We could say we just made a recommendation to go before the Commission. Does that motion allow that subdivision to still be in, and does it affect this one here? No? Yes?

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: I think for every...the Subdivision's actions... This is considered a standing committee and so, really, the vote of the Commission to adopt the recommendations of the Sub-committee – this committee – the vote on that becomes the actual action. So if there is an action that's needed on Items H.1.a. and H.1.b., it, again, will be ordained or adopted by the full Commission's motion, second, and vote on it.

Mr. Mahoney: Well, I'm good.

Mr. Keawe: Okay. We good?

Mr. Ho: Yes. I need a motion.

Mr. Keawe: All right. I move for tentative subdivision map approval for Subdivision Application No. S-2019-2; Sunset Strip Properties, LLC and McBryde Sugar Company, LLC; proposed 12-lot consolidation; TMK: (4) 2-4-016:001 and 020-031; Kalāheo, Kāua'i.

Mr. Mahoney: Second.

Mr. Ho: The motion before us is tentative subdivision map approval (for) S-2019-2. All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 3:0.

Mr. Jung: Thank you, Committee members.

Mr. Bukoski: Thank you, Chair.

Subdivision Application No. S-2019-3; *SUNSET STRIP PROPERTIES, LLC & MCBRYDE SUGAR COMPANY, LLC*; Proposed 18-lot Consolidation; TMK: (4) 2-4-016:001, 013, 015 & 016; Kalāheo, Kaua‘i

Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item (1.)b. – Subdivision Application No. S-2019-3; Sunset Strip Properties, LLC and McBryde Sugar Company, LLC; proposed 18-lot consolidation; TMK: (4) 2-4-016 Parcels 001, 013, 015, and 016; Kalāheo, Kaua‘i.

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

Mr. Bukoski: We have received all various government agencies’ comments and we are recommending tentative approval.

Mr. Ho: Is there anyone representing...Mr. Jung, you are up again.

Mr. Jung: Now I am confused. Again, Ian Jung on behalf of Sunset Strip Properties. I think what Tom and I were just actually talking about back there is we thought that that first action was for this subdivision item. So when we did the cancellation, that was for Phase III. When we did the tentative, that was for the Phase II. Technically, under S-2019-3, we take a tentative action, but not for the one we just revoked.

Mr. Bukoski: So technically, when I recommended that S-2019-2 be revoked, that was the one that was pertaining to S-2006-4. And then as (in the) previous meeting when we had...both were deferred due to the regular meeting; however, the S-2019-3 subdivision, which is the one we are currently on, is what the applicant is recommending approval and we had an agreement on this – just to clarify – between the Commission and also...

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: Okay. To further clarify, S-2019-2 – that involved the same 12 lots that were handled in the stipulation to revoke the subdivision.

Mr. Jung: Correct, yes.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: And that’s going to be...

Mr. Jung: Gone.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: Gone and back to as it previously was prior to the subdivision.

Mr. Jung: Right.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: But your explanation on the consolidation and re-subdivision – that is pertaining to the 18 lots and its (TMK) 2-4-016 Parcels 001, 013, 015, and 016.

Mr. Jung: Correct.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: Okay.

Mr. Ho: Mr. Cua, weigh in again, please. What are your comments?

Mr. Cua: In your discussion with Mr. Shigemoto, and maybe just for the Commissioners' clarification, we have two applications here: S-2019-2 and S-2019-3. In S-2019-2, does this consolidation affect the lots in Phase III of the previous subdivision that was processed through–

Mr. Jung: So that was for Phase III.

Mr. Cua: Right.

Mr. Jung: And then in our conversations with the Planning Department, I think the way we wanted to strategize the subdivision report on that that it was an approval of the stipulation to revoke the subdivision for S-2019-3, which is the one we are actually on now; was the conversation we just had.

Mr. Cua: This is Phase II.

Mr. Jung: That's for Phase II, correct.

Mr. Cua: Right, and you are not cancelling that subdivision, right?

Mr. Jung: Correct. So I will take responsibility for this because I thought we were on that item, so my apologies to the Committee.

Mr. Cua: Okay.

Mr. Jung: So, procedurally, I think if you just reconsider the prior vote, then apply it to Item 1.b., and take the same action, I think we would be–

Mr. Cua: Right, because–

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: We will take it step-by-step.

Mr. Jung: Okay.

Mr. Cua: Right.

Mr. Jung: My apologies, Commissioners.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: I think in order to address the previous action, we would need a motion to reconsider and a second, and then we can go forward.

Mr. Mahoney: I make a motion to...move to reconsider the previous action.

Mr. Keawe: Second.

Mr. Ho: Motion on the floor is to reconsider. All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 3:0.

Jodi, guide us; now where do we go? 1.b.?

Mr. Cua: While Jodi is researching--

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: Yes, let me look real quick.

Mr. Cua: So essentially, the procedure, by reconsidering that motion to approve Subdivision Application No. S-2019-2...the intent of the subdivision application, as I read it, was to consolidate those 12 lots in Phase III. But through the stipulation by revoking the subdivision, you essentially eliminate all those lots that were created through that Phase III subdivision, so therefore, it wasn't necessary to consolidate these lots.

Mr. Jung: Correct.

Mr. Ho: So where are we, Dale?

Mr. Cua: By reconsidering the motion to approve S-2019-2, essentially, in my opinion, there shouldn't be any action...no, the only action needed for this application is contingent on the full Commission's ratification of the stipulation because, then, if the Commission ratifies the stipulation, then action on this particular application, S-2019-2, is not needed because it clears the slate.

Mr. Ho: And 1.b.?

Mr. Cua: As far as 1.b., this is a separate area of the project and is not affected by the stipulation.

Mr. Ho: Okay. It is not affected by the stipulation--

Mr. Cua: Correct.

Mr. Ho: --so the Commission is out of it.

Mr. Cua: Yes.

Mr. Ho: This is what we have to consider now before us – tentative subdivision approval for 1.b.

Mr. Cua: Right. But technically, S-2019-2 is still in limbo since there is no action because you reconsidered the motion, right? The initial motion was to approve S-2019-2, and now it was a reconsideration of that motion, so technically, there is no action on S-2019-2. So it leaves it in limbo and the reason is so that it is contingent on the stipulation.

Mr. Keawe: Right. So that will be part of the stipulation, right? This action that was taken...okay, got it.

Mr. Mahoney: Yes, (1.)a. takes precedence.

Mr. Keawe: All right. So now Subdivision Application (No.) S-2019-3 is a totally separate issue–

Mr. Cua: Correct.

Mr. Keawe: –which we can move on as a separate issue.

Mr. Cua: Correct, yes.

Mr. Ho: One moment, please. Mr. Shigemoto, Mr. Jung, how do we stand on this?

Mr. Jung: Yes, no, that is correct. Where we are at now is on 1.b., which is S-2019-3, which was then the tentative to do the consolidation of the 18 lots into 1 master and 2 reservoir lots.

Mr. Ho: Are we in agreement on that?

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: In effect, it places you in a position prior to the previous motion and second and vote, so we are back to square one. Technically, again, the clarification was there is no action that is needed on this particular item.

Mr. Cua: This is on Item 1.a.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: This is Item H.1.a.

Mr. Keawe: That's 1.a. Yes, 1.a. we already...

Mr. Cua: Yes.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: Right.

Mr. Ho: We still have to take a vote on 1.b.

Mr. Keawe: Right.

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: Yes.

Mr. Keawe: And, again, it is still a tentative subdivision approval for this particular application.

Mr. Jung: Correct.

Mr. Keawe: Correct, Mr. Jung?

Mr. Jung: That's correct.

Mr. Keawe: Jodi?

Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa: Yes.

Mr. Keawe: Okay.

Mr. Ho: All right.

Mr. Keawe: Ready? Oh, Chair?

Mr. Ho: Chair asks for a motion.

Mr. Keawe: All right. I move for tentative subdivision map approval – Subdivision Application No. S-2019-3; Sunset Strip Properties, LLC and McBryde Sugar Company, LLC; proposed 18-lot consolidation; TMK: (4) 2-4-016:001, 013, 015, and 016; Kalāheo, Kaua'i.

Mr. Mahoney: Second.

Mr. Ho: Motion before us – tentative subdivision map approval (for) S-2019-3. All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 3:0.

Mr. Jung: Thank you, again, Committee (members). My apologies for misdirecting you.

Mr. Bukoski: Thank you, Chair.

NEW BUSINESS (For Action)

Subdivision Extension Request

Subdivision Application No. S-2016-2; KUKUI'ULA DEVELOPMENT CO, LLC;
Proposed 29-lot Subdivision, TMK: (4) 2-6-015:014; Kōloa, Kaua'i

Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item I, New Business for Action. Subdivision extension request – Subdivision Application No. S-2016-2; Kukui'ula Development Company, LLC; proposed 29-lot subdivision; TMK: (4) 2-6-015 Parcel 014; Kōloa, Kaua'i.

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

Mr. Bukoski: I will hold off on my recommendation, Commissioners.

Mr. Ho: Is there someone from Kukui‘ula Development Company here, please?

Mr. Lindsay Crawford: Good morning, Commissioners. For the record, Lindsay Crawford, Kukui‘ula Development Company.

Mr. Ho: Good morning, Lindsay.

Mr. Crawford: Good morning.

Mr. Ho: Commissioners, do you have any questions for Lindsay?

Mr. Keawe: Can you give us an update, Lindsay, on where you are and the reason for the request?

Mr. Crawford: Yes. This is a fairly simple one. Basically, we are at the last nine-yard line where we need to get the bond amounts from the agencies, and that is about it.

Mr. Ho: Is this your first extension request?

Mr. Crawford: No, this is the third extension request. This has been going through a process (inaudible) for a number of years unfortunately.

Mr. Keawe: Chair? Are you comfortable that the extension to October of next year...you can get it all put together?

Mr. Crawford: Yes.

Mr. Ho: Further discussion? None? Motion, Commissioners.

Mr. Mahoney: The Planner’s recommendation.

Mr. Keawe: We need the recommendation.

Mr. Bukoski: Okay. It is recommended that an extension until October 25, 2019, be granted to obtain final subdivision map approval. However, the applicant is made aware that an updated status report on the subdivision with a detailed time chronology on the progress of the tentative approval requirements shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review for further extension requests. The status report shall be submitted to the Planning Department no later than 60 days prior to the expiration date.

Mr. Ho: A motion, please, gentlemen.

Mr. Mahoney: Chair, I move to approve Subdivision Application No. S-2016-2 – Kukui‘ula Development Company, LLC.

Mr. Keawe: Second.

Mr. Ho: Motion on the floor is to approve (the) extension request. All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 3:0. You have it, Lindsay.

Mr. Crawford: Thank you, Commissioners.

Mr. Bukoski: Thank you, Chair.

Subdivision Application No. S-2018-2; Kukui‘ula DEVELOPMENT CO, LLC; Proposed 13-lot Consolidation; TMK: (4) 2-6-022: Por. 021; Kōloa, Kaua‘i

Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item I.1.b. – Subdivision Application No. S-2018-2; Kukui‘ula Development Company, LLC; proposed 13-lot consolidation; TMK: (4) 2-6-022 portion of Parcel 021; Kōloa, Kaua‘i.

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

Mr. Bukoski: I will hold off on my recommendation, Commissioners.

Mr. Ho: Is there someone in the audience again?

Mr. Crawford: Yes. Again, for the record, Lindsay Crawford, Kukui‘ula Development Company.

Mr. Ho: Hello, Lindsay. Commissioners?

Mr. Keawe: Chair? The same question, Lindsay – where are you in this project? Obviously the concern would be another two or three extensions. Is this further along? Are you still in the same...?

Mr. Crawford: This is a much younger map. We are very much in the last stages of this one, also. Basically–

Mr. Keawe: As opposed to the previous one we discussed?

Mr. Crawford: Correct. This is the first extension for this one. Basically, the only remaining issue is just to work out one last little issue with a sidewalk. It has been recently added to the plans and is in review at the Department of Public Works right now.

Mr. Keawe: So it would be reasonable to assume that, should your extension be granted, you would be able to complete it by November of next year.

Mr. Crawford: Absolutely. We want to do it as soon as possible on this particular subdivision.

There is one correction. Mr. Shigemoto pointed this out to me; I forgot to look at this. There is a typo on your agenda. It says the word “consolidation” where it should be “subdivision”; just to clarify that.

Mr. Bukoski: Oh, thank you. My recommendation for the project – it is recommended that an extension until November 14, 2019, be granted to obtain final subdivision approval. However, the applicant is made aware that an updated status report on the subdivision with a detailed time chronology on the progress of the tentative approval requirements shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review for further extension requests. The status report shall be submitted to the Planning Department no later than 60 days prior to the expiration date.

Mr. Ho: One question. Chance, if the applicant submits a written request for an extension, do they still have to come before the Subdivision Committee?

Mr. Bukoski: Formality-wise, the applicant has a year to file for final map approval; however, if the applicant does not provide a pre-final map or a final map within that year, they have an opportunity to write a request (with) justifiable reasons on why to extend their time period within the subdivision application.

Mr. Ho: And it still has to come before the Committee?

Mr. Bukoski: Correct.

Mr. Ho: Thank you. Gentlemen?

Mr. Keawe: Ready? I move to approve the subdivision extension request for Subdivision Application No. S-2018-2, Kukui‘ula Development Company, LLC – extension to November 14, 2019, with an updated status report 60 days prior.

Mr. Mahoney: Second.

Mr. Ho: The motion before us is to approve (the) subdivision application extension request. All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 3:0.

Mr. Crawford: Thank you.

Mr. Bukoski: Thank you, Chair.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item J, Adjournment.

Mr. Ho: I need a motion for adjournment, please.

Mr. Mahoney: Chair, move to adjourn.

Mr. Keawe: Second.


Mr. Ho: All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 3:0.

Mr. Bukoski: Thank you.

Mr. Ho: We are adjourned.

Subdivision Committee Chair Ho adjourned the meeting at 9:06 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by:



Darcie Agaran
Commission Support Clerk

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

() Approved as amended. See minutes of _____ meeting.