



SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Remoaldo requested page 5, second bullet, meat pre area change to meat prep area.            Chair Larson requested page 6, second bullet, various roof pitch change to various roof pitches.            Chair Larson requested page 7, fourth bullet, recuse themselves to recuses themselves.</p>	<p>minutes as circulated. Mr. Ida seconded the motion.</p> <p>Chair Larson called for a vote to approve the amended June 16, 2022, minutes with a correction on page 5, “meat pre area” to “meat prep area; page 6, “various roof pitch” to “various roof pitches” and page 7, “recuse themselves” to “recuses themselves”. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
<p><b>E. General Business</b></p>	<p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa said there <b>was</b> no general business.</p>	
<p><b>F. Communications</b></p>	<p>a. Email Memorandum and revised plans from ADM Architecture + Interiors dated October 11, 2022 to transmit the revised preliminary plans for Sueoka Market for the commission to review in advance of a future meeting.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa said the memorandum from Architect Grant Sumile was a mockup that incorporated the discussions and comments that took place at the site visit, and it was not an action item.</p>	<p>Mr. Guerber moved to receive the memorandum and revised plans from ADM Architecture + Interiors dated October 11, 2022 to transmit revised preliminary plans for Sueoka Market for the commission to review in advance of a future meeting. Ms. Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>G. Unfinished Business</b></p>	<p><b>G.1. Gay &amp; Robinson, Inc. – Kaumakani Avenue</b>  <b>Proposed demolition and proposed reconstruction of two existing single-family residences</b>  <b>Tax Map Key: (4) 1-7-006:001</b></p> <p>Consideration of a Class I Zoning Permit for the proposed demolition and the proposed reconstruction of two existing single-family homes located within the Kaumakani Avenue.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa asked if <b>there was</b> anyone in the audience <b>who</b> wanted to testify on this agenda item, hearing none, <b>she asked Mr. Hironaka</b>. Planner Myles Hironaka confirmed there were no public attendees online.</p> <p>Planner Marisa Valenciano stated at the August 18, 2022, meeting the commission approved demolition and requested the applicant to return for the window update. She called up Director Ka’aina Hull to share his discovery with the commission.</p> <p>Mr. Hull updated the commission on their meeting with building division to inquire about the possibility to preserve and use the historic windows. To their surprise they learned of an exemption from building code standards that was permitted by building division. Unbeknownst to them the exemption could be obtained with the following conditions; the structure must be deemed historic, and it must undergo a full preservation and restoration of the structure. What that meant was the structure would need to be repaired and reconstructed in the original method which included single wall construction, preservation of windows, utilization of the floors and retrofits, the entire structure would be a historic preservation project which included use of same materials. Mr. Hull asked the commission to be aware that most of the structures in this project were unable to be repaired and the applicant proposed demolition.</p> <p>Chair Larson said these structures could use the exemption and do a full restoration. Vice Chair Long replied cost would be a major factor and Mr. Hull added that acquiring skilled services to perform the restoration would be another factor.</p> <p>Vice Chair Long said they did not have the August meeting minutes to reference and he clearly remembered the applicant wanted to replicate the structures as closely as possible to the existing</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>structures. The word “replicate” was used by the applicant which gave him hope of the applicant’s commitment to replicate the structures original features. Chair Larson remembered the word “replicate” also but recalled that they were not planning to use the same type of windows and doors.</p> <p>Chair Larson stated the commission accepts this project with the condition that they replicate the windows and doors as close as possible to the original.</p> <p>Mr. Guerber commented that Waimea Plantation Gardens reused old single wall plantation homes and he encouraged the use of single walls in these structures.</p> <p>Ms. Summers stated there was a conflict with some of the commissioners in their single wall construction comments. Since the applicant planned to demolish the structure and rebuild it would be considered new construction and single wall construction would not be required.</p> <p>Gay &amp; Robinson, Inc. Real Estate Director Koa Duncan acknowledged the commissions concerns to “replicate” and stated they would like to move forward with their plans to demolish and rebuild to the form and character of the existing structures. The new windows would match as close as possible to the original. Gay &amp; Robinson, Inc. Vice President Howard Green (<i>attended by Zoom</i>) added that the doors would have indentions and trim to match a plantation style. Plain flat doors would not be used.</p> <p>Mr. Duncan passed out a color photo of Kaumakani eight homes that the commission approved in the past. (<i>An electronic copy was emailed to Commissioner Summers</i>). The homes were demolished and rebuilt to closely match the original. Vice Chair Long didn’t understand why they were given copies to view when the windows installed in the photo were not historical. Mr. Green explained that the vinyl windows closely matched the original double hung windows.</p> <p>Chair Larson reiterated the commission’s request for the windows and doors to closely match the original look and encouraged the applicant to seek sources that could produce these products. She stated windows and doors made a difference visually and it was important to restore since the structures were on Kaumakani’s main avenue.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>DCA Stephen Hall briefly highlighted the commissions comments as followings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vice Chair Long commented on replicating windows and doors to closely match original.</li> <li>• Mr. Guerber commented on use of single wall construction.</li> <li>• Chair Larson commented on keeping the character of the windows and doors and different from vinyl windows.</li> </ul> <p>Chair Larson added that the commission ruled out on the use of single wall construction. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated these comments would be used to advise the department to consider when issuing a building or zoning permit and could be added as a suggestion or recommendation.</p> <p>Mr. Guerber asked if the buildings were termite infested and once demolished it allowed the applicant to build what they want. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa replied yes, this was an opportunity for the applicant to hear the concerns from the commission but in the end the applicant could proceed with their plans; however, they expressed their willingness to restore with the commissions suggestions as much as possible. Mr. Guerber addressed the applicants and said they understood the commissions strong concerns and hope they take their comments into consideration.</p> <p>Chair Larson recommended to amend the motion and include the condition that replacement windows and doors be wooden and match closely to the original.</p>	<p>Vice Chair Long <b>moved</b> to support the applicant and their representation before the commission that they would like to replicate these historical buildings. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. (<i>motion died no vote</i>)</p> <p>Vice Chair Long <b>moved</b> to amend the original motion and include the condition that replacement windows and doors be wooden and match closely to the original. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. (<i>motion died no vote</i>)</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Hull added that this application must be reviewed and acted on by the department to meet specific deadlines and timelines. Once a zoning permit application is submitted its reviewed within the deadlines or its automatically approved. The applicant expressed willingness to work with the commission but was also held to these specific deadlines and timelines. For this reason, the applicant may not have a chance to return and present their proposed reconstruction before</p>	<p>Vice Chair Long <b>moved</b> that the applicant present KHPRC in the future with proposed plans and elevations of the homes that they plan to rebuild that meet current building codes such that could not be replicated which would be reconstruction as closely as possible to the historic house as it existed now and in particular emphasis on true divided light double hung wood windows, accurate historical doors and any other materials and finishes on the exterior that support that motion and also recognizing that the applicant would like to revise the interior floor plan layout that KHPRC supports and that the applicant comes before KHPRC at a future meeting to present their proposed reconstruction. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. Motion carried 5:1 (<i>Summers-Nay</i>)</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>the commission.</p> <p>Vice Chair Long replied that he was informed by the department's staff that this was a preliminary presentation, and a building permit was not submitted. He confessed he was not familiar with the departments timeline and asked if the applicant would agree to return at a future meeting. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa suggested it might be helpful to amend the motion and insert direction and specifications, instead of requesting that the applicant return. Mr. Hull stated that Ms. Valenciano worked closely with applicants when a zoning permit is submitted. He said there are applicants who could choose to not consider all the recommendations of this commission but added he was not talking about this applicant. Due to the strict zoning permit deadlines the applicant may not return for the commission to review. Vice Chair Long replied he understood and in his opinion the department had not received an acceptable accurate application and the applicant should not be in any deadline. Mr. Hull replied that it was not the responsibility, and this commission did not have the authority to advise the department whether a permit application was acceptable or accurate. Mr. Hull reiterated the 21-day deadline the department had to review applications. Vice Chair Long replied that this commission voted and approved an acceptable application would include accurate and complete before and proposed floor plans, exterior elevations and materials, finishes, color schedule and that information has not been provided to the commission today.</p> <p>Chair Larson stated the motion could be revised to include these conditions. Vice Chair Long said in addition to the proposal made he wanted to add that specific attention be given to the doors, windows, siding, and color.</p> <p>DCA Hall advised that the commission do a "motion to reconsider" the last motion that passed and then make a new motion.</p> <p>Mr. Greene commented that Mr. Duncan handed out pictures of a successful project that KHPRC approved in the past. He said the Kaumakani avenue was an asset, and they want to preserve that historic place and keep it beautiful.</p> <p><i>Chair Larson called for a five-minute recess at 2:32 p.m.</i></p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p><i>Chair Larson called the meeting back to order at 2:37 p.m.</i></p> <p>Mr. Greene continued that working with single wall construction and procuring materials to original specifications was difficult and made it cost prohibited. They want to make a safe home with modern living standards, energy efficient and would try to maintain the historical nature of the avenue.</p> <p>Vice Chair Long commented that if the applicant adhered to the commissions comments they would not need to return to the commission. Chair Larson called for the vote.</p> <p>Ms. Summers explained her reason for voting against the motion was because she personally</p>	<p>Mr. Guerber moved to reconsider Vice Chair Longs motion. Vice Chair Long seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p> <p>The committee voted again on Vice Chair Longs original motion. Motion failed 0:6.</p> <p>Vice Chair Long moved that the applicant reconstructs these historic homes as close as possible to the existing original home as is that they are going to demolish and specific attention be given to installing true divided light wood double hung windows, doors as closely representative of the existing and siding and color as close to existing. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried 5:1 (<i>Summers-Nay</i>)</p>



SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>H. New Business</b></p>	<p>priced wood windows and the cost could prohibit the applicant from using it for this project.</p> <p><b>H.1. TRILEAF (on behalf of Verizon Wireless)</b>  <b>Proposed installation of a new telecommunications facility on an existing rooftop at the Sheraton Kaua'i Coconut Beach Resort Hotel along with new ground equipment cabinets, underground utilities, and associated improvements</b></p> <p>Sheraton Kaua'i Coconut Beach Resort Hotel          650 Aleka Loop, Kapa'a          Tax Map Key: (4) 4-3-007:028          Kapa'a, Hawai'i</p> <p>National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting parties          a. Director's report pertaining to this matter.</p> <p>Planner Marisa Valenciano read portions of the directors' report;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commission's action for the project was to;             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide comments for identification of cultural and historic resources.</li> <li>2. Defer providing comments.</li> <li>3. Provide comment of no comments</li> </ol> </li> <li>• The department recommended the commission provide comments for the Section 106 letter.</li> </ul> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated there was no one from the public to testify and Mr. Hironaka stated no attendees raised their digital hand.</p> <p>Megan Austin (<i>entered by Zoom</i>) with Trileaf Corporation consulting firm responsible for Section 106 and Kathy O'Connor Phelps (<i>entered by Zoom</i>) who submitted permit application on behalf of Verizon did not have a presentation and other Verizon representatives were available to answer any questions.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Phelps stated they provided a cultural report, no coconut trees would be removed, and they would not move the equipment.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Ida asked if there was any archaeological study done specifically for this project. Ms. Austin replied yes. An SOI (Secretary of Interior) qualified archaeologist completed a cultural survey, and it was submitted to the State Historic Preservation Department for review. She stated the visual area of potential effect was outlined on page 5, of the cultural resource report and on page 52 of the SHPD (State of Hawai'i Historic Preservation Division) submittal package sent on October 14, 2023. SHPD has not responded back to them, they anticipate a response in a few weeks.</li> <li>• Mr. Ida asked if an archaeologist was on site. Ms. Austin replied yes.</li> <li>• Mr. Ida asked if there was any subsurface testing done. Ms. Austin replied no.</li> <li>• Mr. Ida asked if SHPD directed them to complete any follow-up study. Ms. Austin confirmed no shovel test kits were conducted on the site since it was the existing paved parking lot.</li> <li>• Chair Larson asked if they received any recommendations from SHPD. Ms. Austin replied no and since their application was sent on October 14, they anticipate a response around mid-November.</li> <li>• Vice Chair Long asked Mr. Ida if he had any concerns that sub-surface testing was not done. Mr. Ida replied yes, there should be subsurface investigation before the project starts. He stated his concerns were that there were burials close to the site of the project, burials to the north of the property and when the resort was built there were no state burial laws in place.</li> <li>• Chair Larson asked if this project was going to the arborist advisory committee. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa replied probably not since no trees were going to be disturbed. Ms. Valenciano added the applicant was going to add a notation on the plans. Chair Larson stated the coconut grove was an historic property and asked the applicant if they would consider planting new trees in areas where there once were trees.</li> </ul> <p>Noah Bronson of Verizon stated the site plans noted that the trees would not be disturbed. Mr.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Bronson reassured the commission that no trees were proposed to be removed and ground equipment would be on the existing paved parking lot and antennas on the buildings roof.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair Larson asked if greenery was going to be added around the new unit that was going to be placed on the ground. Ms. Austin replied no, bollards would be placed around that area.</li> <li>• Mr. Ida asked Chair Larson if she said the coconut grove was a historic site. Chair Larson replied no, but if she did, what she meant was the historic grove itself was historic. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa clarified that the grove was designated as an exceptional tree. Mr. Ida was concerned about the coconut grove which to him was not cultural but very historic. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa said the exceptional tree designation did not prevent them from including comments in the Section 106 letter.</li> </ul> <p>Chair Larson said the grove was an essential feature of that community and crucial to the view and ambience in that area and represented the remainder of a larger grove that used to be there. She questioned the visual impact of the placement of the equipment on one side of the grove and suggested a green barrier between the equipment and the grove would be more appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Phelps asked if Chair Larson referred to the ground equipment. Chair Larson said it looked like the ground equipment would be placed right next to the grove. Ms. Phelps replied no, its more towards the beach. She said the area did not have the space to fit greenery because it had a beach access easement and was mostly concrete. She commented that adding greenery would not add to the area because it was in the back shipping area.</li> </ul> <p>Chair Larson summed up the discussion and said the commission had concerns with what was under the paved areas and Mr. Guerber added they were concerned with where they would trench. Ms. Phelps inserted a correction and said the access road placed on plans would not be trenched and the fiber and electrical trench would be behind the coconut trees, the trench would be about three feet wide. She confirmed no trenching in the parking lot.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Guerber asked how deep the trench would be. Ms. Phelps did not have that information. Mr. Bronson did not have the information also but said it would be like a typical utility trench. Mr. Ida stated they did not have to dig very deep to uncover burials or cultural materials. Mr. Bronson replied that they could have someone on site to inspect during trenching. Ms. Phelps added that planning commission placed into their conditions of approval that archaeological cultural monitoring be required during all ground disturbing activities.</li> <li>• Ms. Remoaldo referred to page A04, showed the building and coconut trees and asked if it was existing coconut trees. Mr. Bronson replied yes, it was existing coconut trees.</li> <li>• Ms. Remoaldo asked if the drawings were accurate because the building was taller than the coconut trees. Mr. Bronson replied yes, that was accurate. Ms. Phelps added that they measured the diameter and height of each coconut tree. Ms. Remoaldo stated her concern was the visual impact the roof top antennas would have and the effect it would have on the ambience of the location. Mr. Bronson replied they were installing stealth antennas that would be located inside a structure that blended into the existing building. The antennas would not be visible. Ms. Phelps added that it was an extension of the existing stairwell.</li> <li>• Chair Larson stated it would increase the existing height of the building and asked for the original height of the building. Ms. Phelps referred to page A03. Mr. Bronson replied it would be a 10' increase.</li> <li>• Chair Larson asked how big the box was. Ms. Phelps said the dimensions were on A01, 9' wide by 29'7" across.</li> </ul> <p>Ms. Remoaldo suggested they hide the proposed equipment without it interfering with the area. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa said they could recommend camouflaging the equipment with landscaping to blend into the surrounding environment. Ms. Remoaldo stated if the applicant is unable to add plants in the area, they could use potted plants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair Larson asked the applicant for their suggestion to help with enhancing the visual aspect of the equipment so it could blend into the area. Mr. Bronson replied landscaping wouldn't be appropriate, but they could do a special fence concealing the</li> </ul>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>equipment. They would work with the resort.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chair Larson asked if the issue was space. Mr. Bronson replied yes, they would be using smaller equipment to not take up so much room in the resort.</li> </ul> <p>Chair Larson asked if there were any comments. With no comments from the commission for the Section 106 letter they moved on to the next agenda item.</p>	
<p><b>I. Executive Session</b></p>	<p><b>1. Gay &amp; Robinson, Inc. – Kaumakani Avenue</b>  <b>Proposed demolition and proposed reconstruction of two existing single-family residences</b>          Tax Map Key: (4) 1-7-006:001</p> <p>Consideration of a Class I Zoning Permit for the proposed demolition and proposed reconstruction of two existing single-family homes located within the Kaumakani Avenue.</p> <p><b>2. TRILEAF (on behalf of Verizon Wireless)</b>  <b>Proposed installation of a new telecommunications facility on an existing rooftop at the Sheraton Kaua'i Coconut Beach Resort Hotel along with new ground equipment cabinets, underground utilities, and associated improvements</b></p> <p>Sheraton Kaua'i Coconut Beach Resort Hotel          650 Aleka Loop, Kapa'a          Tax Map Key: (4) 4-3-007:028          Kapa'a, Hawai'i</p> <p>National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting parties          a. Director's report pertaining to this matter.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated both agenda items were completed and there was no need for any further discussions in executive session.</p>	
<p><b>J. Announcements</b></p>	<p>Ms. Valenciano announced the following;          a. <b>Historic Hawai'i Foundation</b></p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p><b>Hawai'i Preservation in Practice Training Seminar: Identifying &amp; Documenting Character-Defining Features</b>            Wednesday, October 26, 2022            10:00am-11:30am            Virtual Webinar via Zoon</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa said the October 26, seminar was live so commissioners would be able to ask questions. Advance registration was required.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa shared that the National Historic Preservation would conduct an online training November 1-4, and the department would reach out to commissioners with more information, registration may be required.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano notified the commission that the November 17, meeting would be the last meeting of the year, no meeting in December.</p>	
<p><b>K. Selection of Next Meeting Date and Agenda Topics</b></p>	<p>Next meeting was scheduled for 1:30 p.m. Thursday, November 17, 2022, Regular Meeting</p>	
<p><b>L. Adjournment</b></p>	<p>With no further business to conduct, Chair Larson called for a motion to adjourn.</p>	<p>Ms. Remoaldo moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Ida seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p> <p>Chair Larson adjourned the meeting at 3:27 p.m.</p>

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewed and Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Sandra M. Muragin, Commission Support Clerk Carolyn Larson, Chair

- ( ) Approved as circulated.
- ( X ) Approved with amendments. See minutes of 08/17/23 meeting.