

COUNTY OF KAUA'I
Minutes of Meeting
OPEN SESSION

Board/Commission:	Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission	Meeting Date	April 15, 2021
Location	Teleconference by Microsoft Teams	Start of Meeting: 1:43 p.m.	End of Meeting: 3:50 p.m.
Present	Chair Gerald Ida. Vice Chair Susan Remoaldo. Commissioners: James Guerber, Carolyn Larson, Stephen Long and Aubrey Summers. Deputy County Attorney Stephen Hall. Planning Department Staff: Planning Director Ka'aina Hull, Planner Marisa Valenciano and Commission Specialist Shanlee Jimenez. Office of Boards and Commissions: Administrator Ellen Ching and Commission Support Clerk Sandra Muragin.		
Excused			
Absent			
SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION	
	The meeting was delayed due to Boards and Commissions computer audio problems.		
A. Call To Order	Chair Ida called the meeting to order at 1:43 p.m.		
B. Roll Call	Planning Director Ka'aina Hull verified attendance by roll call and requested a verbal response; Commissioner Guerber replied here. Commissioner Larson replied present. Commissioner Long replied here. Commissioner Summers replied present. Vice Chair Remoaldo replied here. Chair Ida replied here.		Quorum was established with six commissioners present.
C. Approval of the Agenda			Ms. Summers moved to approve the agenda, as circulated. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.
D. Approval of the Minutes	Mr. Hull announced there were no minutes to approve. He explained that Boards and Commissions staff were also assigned to Kaua'i Emergency Management Agency two days a week and behind in their work.		

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
E. Communications	There were none.	
F. Public Comment	Mr. Hull announced that any member of the public could testify on any agenda item now. Hearing none, he moved on to the next agenda item.	
G. General Business Matters	There were none.	
H. Unfinished Business	<p>H.1. County of Kaua'i, Department of Public Works – Engineering Division Waimea River Ford Crossing Project Tax Map Key(s): (4) 1-6-001:027 (por.) and (4) 1-6-001:888 National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Initial Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archeological Literature Review and Field Inspection Report for the Waimea River Ford Crossing Project. • Director's Report pertaining to this matter <p>Ms. Valenciano shared portions of the Director's Report dated April 15, 2021;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This agenda item was deferred by the commission at the February 18, 2021 meeting. • The action before the commission was to respond to the applicants Section 106 request for consultation; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recommendation to provide additional comments ○ Defer comments to a future meeting • The department's recommendation was for the commission to provide comments to the applicant's findings. <p>County of Kaua'i Chief Engineer of Public Works Michael Moule presented the project to the commission and introduced Engineer and Project Manager Christie Bagley. He shared a power point presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scope of the project was to replace the existing crossing with another underwater crossing that would provide a reliable access for residents and farmers who needed to cross the Waimea River. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displayed a concept plan view of where and how they plan to construct the crossing. • Presented two options for the underwater crossing; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Option one was a submerged concrete foundation. Concrete sections would be embedded deep below the surface to prevent erosion. ○ Option two was a rock and gabion foundation. Wire baskets filled with rocks would form the floor for the crossing. • Reported findings of no significant impact (FONSI) and no further archaeological work proposed. • Held a public meeting in October. The farmers and residents who access the crossing wanted the project. The public against the project cited the crossing could easily wash away during floods and heavy rain, allow unwanted traffic and suggested a gate be installed. • Option one would provide a longer life span of the crossing, but no final decision was made on which option they would select. • Both options would be engineered and constructed to withstand the flow of the river and prevent it from being easily washed away. <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Guerber asked if a structure currently existed in the area now or if it was a mud/dirt path. Mr. Mole responded no structure just mud and rocks. 2. Ms. Larson asked why a ford river crossing was needed and to explain the problem. Mr. Mole responded the crossing was washed away and in a condition that not even a four-wheeled truck could cross. 3. Ms. Larson asked if the reason for the trucks not being able to cross the river was because the water was too high or if the surface of the crossing was uneven. Mr. Mole responded the surface was damaged and under normal conditions if the crossing was not damaged trucks would only be able to cross when the water level was low. 4. Ms. Larson inquired about the pile of dirt on the riverbank and if it was from maintaining the crossing. Mr. Mole was not sure how or where the dirt came from. 5. Ms. Larson asked if the dirt approach into and out of the river was too slippery. Mr. Mole replied that the east side bank was steep and washed out. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>6. Vice Chair Remoaldo asked if rock and gabion crossing existed on Kaua'i or anywhere in the state. Mr. Mole was not aware of any on island.</p> <p>7. Mr. Guerber questioned why the commission was reviewing the project since it contained no historic structure. Mr. Mole responded that they were following Section 106 process that required consultation and review by this commission.</p> <p>With no further questions from the commission Chair Ida called for a motion.</p>	<p>Mr. Guerber moved to support the County of Kaua'i, Department of Public Works – Engineering Division-Waimea River Ford Crossing Project, Tax Map Key(s): (4) 1-6-001:027 (por.) and (4) 1-6-001:888, National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties project. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
	<p>H.2. Discussion regarding minimum requirements for project presentations before the Kaua'i Historic Review Preservation Commission.</p> <p>a. Director's Report pertaining to this matter.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano stated this agenda item was at the request of the commission and shared the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February 2020 the commission discussed ideas to develop a checklist of minimum requirements for all KHPRC applicants to complete before presenting their project to the commission. • Provided copies of the original checklist dated February 20, 2020 and the revised checklist dated April 2, 2021. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The action before the commission was to review the revised checklist and recommend comments. <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms. Larson was concerned that the additional requirements would place a burden on the applicant and asked how much more information was the revised checklist requesting in comparison to what was normally accepted. Mr. Hull said a zoning and building permit required site plans, floor plans and elevation plans. He said additional requests could become costly to the applicant and may discourage them from pulling the required permits. 2. Mr. Long commented that the commission was responsible for reviewing proposed changes to existing historical structures and the request for existing and proposed site plans, floor plans and exterior elevations would be appropriate. Mr. Hull agreed, that would be the minimum requirement for a zoning permit. 3. Mr. Long commented that exterior elevations always identify material, color and finishes which were required. Mr. Hull replied that not all historic assets would require exterior elevations if only interior work was going to be done. Mr. Hull stated the minimum requirements needed were site plans, floor plans and elevations. Should additional information be necessary for the commission to review they would ask for photo documentation to get the feel for the form character and integrity of the structure. 4. Ms. Valenciano said she acts as the gatekeeper and reviews each applicant and has had to ask for clarification and additional information when necessary. 5. Ms. Larson concurred with Mr. Long and emphasized that materials and finishes were important for the commission to get the historic feel of the site. Referring to the checklist, she felt a photo of the existing structure, historical background and archaeological information were all important not only to the commission but to the applicant. 6. Vice Chair Remoaldo suggested an addendum to the checklist to add references, resources, publication and websites that applicants could access for information and templates of what was needed. She was concerned for the average public applicant that might not be aware of what the documents looked like and how it should be completed. 7. Ms. Larson liked Vice Chair Remoaldo's idea and felt a sample would benefit the applicant. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>8. Mr. Long also thought it was a great idea and said there were great websites the public could access for information like the secretary of interior.</p> <p>9. Mr. Hull said the staff would work on establishing a resource library on the website and asked the commission to feel free to directly contact himself, Jodi Higuchi-Sayegusa or Marisa Valenciano with any ideas to add to the checklist. They could combine and present a report to the commission.</p>	<p>Mr. Long moved to defer discussion regarding minimum requirements for project presentations before the Kaua'i Historic Review Preservation Commission to another meeting. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
<p>I. New Business</p>	<p>I.1. Mucho Aloha Kōloa Brewhouse Lot 4A, Kōloa Road Tax Map Key: (4) 2-8-007:016 Kōloa, Hawai'i</p> <p>a. Letter (3/31/21) from Ian Jung transmitting revised renovation plans. b. Director's Report pertaining to this matter</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano shared a brief overview and recommendation from portions of the Director's Report dated April 15, 2021, on file.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The action before the commission was a proposal for renovation to an existing structure; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support for project ○ Recommendation to approve with conditions ○ Recommendation to deny permits ○ Recommendation to defer action on the permits • The structure was not on the KHPRC inventory list; however, it was brought before the commission because it's surrounded by other buildings that are either on the register, meet 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>the criteria to be on the register and improvements could impact the surroundings which had the potential to be nominated as a historic district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The department recommends the proposed improvements blend with the existing historic structure of the other buildings. <p>Mr. Guerber disclosed a potential conflict of interest because he owned a brewery in Lihue. Representing the applicant Attorney Ian Jung responded that there were no conflicts with Mr. Guerber's disclosure. DCA Hall responded that if there were any financial interest or potential interest in the business you would need to recuse yourself and based on the two locations there would be no conflict of possible competition.</p> <p>Attorney Ian Jung presented the project to the commission with a power point presentation and introduced applicant Gabriel Tennberg.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief history overview of the Old Kōloa Town shops • Shared renovation process that included options that were eliminated and added to conform with planning departments concerns. • Approximately 90% of the renovation would be concentrated on the exterior front courtyard area of the building and included the following changes; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Remove trellis over deck and replace with an extended shed roof ○ Change balusters to diamond shaped instead of horizontal slats ○ Remove existing ramp ○ Remove existing French doors and replace with a single double door ○ Remove both lava rock planters ○ Remove decking material ○ Remove existing front windows and replace with double hung • Shared that planning department addressed concerns with how they planned to attach the shed roof to the building. The shed roof would extend in length on both sides and attach onto the same place that the original trellis roof was attached to on the building. • There were no pending permit's and the project was presented to the commission for review and comment before submitting building permits. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vice Chair Remoaldo was concerned that the extension would affect the large trees nearby. Mr. Jung showed pictures and locations of the nearby avocado and wiliwili trees that were not in the area and would not be affected. 2. Vice Chair Remoaldo asked for the location of the handicap access. Mr. Jung showed plans of the area and Mr. Tennberg replied that ADA access was located on the north side of the building through double doors. 3. Ms. Larson expressed concern about the width of the deck and asked if it was 12 feet wide from the existing building. Mr. Jung showed plans of the area and confirmed it would be 13 feet wide. Ms. Larson said the large deck would decrease the sidewalk area and impede on the planting area in front of the building. Mr. Jung showed plans of the walkway area between the deck and circle planter. Mr. Tennberg said there would be sufficient walkway access and his architect confirmed that it was within code. 4. Ms. Larson commented that the courtyard view would be hampered by the large deck and eliminate the historic feel. Mr. Tennberg replied that the deck may appear larger on the plans; however, it fits the building and within code. Mr. Jung said the new deck would conform to the historic style of the area. 5. Ms. Larson expressed concern about removing the rock wall and eliminating that feature from the proposed deck. She said the rock wall was a significant feature in the area. Mr. Jung showed pictures of the rock wall located on the south side and in front of the building. He replied they planned to reuse the rock for the ramp deck and would work with the planning department to address her concerns. Ms. Larson was unsure if the planters were historic or not, but it represented the style within the courtyard and other places in Kōloa. 6. Ms. Larson stated that the attachment of the proposed new shed roof to the building could damage the woodwork in the area. Mr. Jung showed pictures and plans of the area and where it would be attached to. Mr. Tennberg replied that the shed roof would attach to the building along the beams. 7. Ms. Summers remarked that the front portion of the building was not historical and that was the area that the deck and shed roof would be attached to. She also questioned the proximity of the circle planter in front of the deck, it appeared too close. Mr. Jung showed plans of the entire building and replied that they were adding to the newer part of the 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>building.</p> <p>8. Ms. Larson shared her concerns about all the additions the building sustained throughout the years and the addition of a larger deck could compromise the view and historic character of the area.</p> <p>9. Ms. Larson stated the louvered windows located on the back, gas station side, originally opened but was painted over so it appeared to be a one-piece glass window pane but it was not. She requested they attempt to restore those louvers. Mr. Jung showed plans of the area and Mr. Tennberg replied that the windows were caulked and painted and could not be fixed to reopen again. Ms. Larson asked if they could consider replacing with like windows. Mr. Tennberg replied that they would take another look at the windows and assess if it was fixable.</p> <p>10. Mr. Long supported the departments recommendations noted in the director's report. Mr. Tennberg replied that if they were able to fix the louvers it would not provide the ventilation needed for the kitchen which would be placed in that area.</p> <p>11. Mr. Long requested that the lava rock planters be brought back into the design of the building. Mr. Tennberg replied that they plan to repurpose the lava rocks.</p> <p>12. Ms. Larson suggested a field trip to see the existing building and get a perspective on the size of the proposed deck. Mr. Jung replied that a field trip would setback getting the building permits.</p> <p>There was a lengthy discussion on the size and scale of the deck and the walkway between the planter and deck steps between the commission and applicant. Mr. Tennberg asked that the commission not hold it up the permit processing if it was only on a perceived opinion on the deck size and walkway between the planter and deck step.</p> <p>Mr. Hull suggested that no more than two commissioner's pair up with staff from planning to look at the area. Or if they wanted to plan for the whole commission, it would need to be agendaized and the field trip scheduled in May, since no meeting was planned. He suggested the commission take action;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Take action on the project 2. Defer to May meeting 3. Plan a commission site visit 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>DCA Hall stated that he reviewed their rules again and Mr. Guerber's disclosure of a potential conflict of interest would have no effect on this project; however, at this time the commission could now address their concerns with Mr. Guerbers disclosure. No commissioner raised issue on the disclosure and DCA Hall ruled no conflict.</p> <p>Mr. Guerber queried Ms. Larson and the commission if they wanted to plan a field trip. Mr. Hull requested that the site visit meeting be planned before the May meeting and suggested April 29, 2021, at 1:30 p.m., the Commission unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Mr. Jung thanked the commission and announced that permits would be submitted and if necessary would update the permits after the April 29 special meeting.</p>	<p>Ms. Larson motioned to defer to the May meeting. <i>(motion died with no second)</i></p> <p>Ms. Larson motioned to defer this agenda item to a special meeting on Thursday, April 29, 1:30 p.m. at the proposed site of Mucho Aloha Kōloa Brewhouse, Lot 4A, Kōloa Road, Tax Map Key: (4) 2-8-007:016, Kōloa, Hawai'i. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>
<p>J. Announcements</p>	<p>Mr. Hull announced that planning department received an unprecedented amount of requests, from OIP (Office of Information Practices) and record request for plans which could result in a large volume of applications within a couple of month that could impact the fall agenda.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano announced that the next scheduled meeting would be June 17 and Historic Hawai'i Foundation had a quarterly online training scheduled May 26, on burials. She encouraged the commissioners to attend.</p>	
<p>K. Selection of Next Meeting Date and Agenda Topics (DATE)</p>	<p>Ms. Larson inquired about a fund. Mr. Hull said Ms. Larson could contact Jodi Higuchi-Sayegusa after the meeting on the Certified Local Grant fund or it could be placed on the next agenda. Mr. Long asked that the department prepare a report on the fund at the next meeting.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
L. Adjournment	With no further business to conduct, Chair Ida called for a motion to adjourn.	Vice Chair Remoaldo moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0. Chair Ida adjourned the meeting at 3:50pm

Submitted by: _____
Sandra M. Muragin, Commission Support Clerk

Reviewed and Approved by: _____
Gerald Ida, Chair

(X) Approved as circulated. 08/19/21

() Approved with amendments. See minutes of _____ meeting.