

COUNTY OF KAUA'I  
Minutes of Meeting  
OPEN SESSION

|                   |  |                             |                           |
|-------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Board/Commission: | <b>Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission</b>  | Meeting Date                | <b>August 18, 2022</b>    |
| Location          | Mo'ikeha 2A/2B with remote access by Zoom Teleconference and Audio Connection  | Start of Meeting: 1:33 p.m. | End of Meeting: 2:42 p.m. |
| Present           | Chair Carolyn Larson. Vice Chair Stephen Long. Commissioners: James Guerber, Gerald Ida, Susan Remoaldo and Aubrey Summers ( <i>attended by Zoom</i> ).<br>Deputy County Attorney Stephen Hall ( <i>attended by Zoom</i> ). Planning Department Staff: Director Ka'āina Hull, Planner Marisa Valenciano, Planner Myles Hironaka ( <i>attended by Zoom</i> ), and Commission Support Duke Nakamatsu. Office of Boards and Commissions: Administrator Ellen Ching, and Commission Support Clerk Arleen Kuwamura. |                             |                           |
| Excused           | Commission Support Clerk Sandra Muragin  |                             |                           |
| Absent            |  |                             |                           |

| SUBJECT                           | DISCUSSION  | ACTION   |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>A. Call To Order</b>           | Chair Larson called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.   |  |
| <b>B. Roll Call</b>               | Director Ka'āina Hull verified attendance by roll call and requested a verbal response;<br>Commissioner Guerber replied here.<br>Commissioner Ida replied here.<br>Commissioner Remoaldo replied here.<br>Commissioner Summers replied here.<br>Vice Chair Long replied here.<br>Chair Larson replied here. | Quorum was established with six commissioners present.   |
| <b>C. Approval of the Agenda</b>  |   | Ms. Remoaldo moved to approve the August 18, 2022 agenda, as circulated. Mr. Ida seconded the motion.<br>Motion carried 6:0. |
| <b>D. Approval of the Minutes</b> | 1. June 16, 2022<br><br>Mr. Hull informed the commission there were no minutes to approve and moved on to the next agenda item.   |  |

| SUBJECT                       | DISCUSSION  | ACTION  |
|-------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>E. General Business</b>    | Mr. Hull said there were no general business.   |   |
| <b>F. Communications</b>      | <p>a. Memorandum from ADM Inc. dated August 5, 2022 to transmit revised preliminary plans for Sueoka market for the commission to review prior to the October meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Hull asked if anyone present wanted to testify on this agenda item. Hearing none, he asked if anyone attending by Zoom wanted to testify on this agenda item. Planner Myles Hironaka verified that no public attendees were on Zoom.</p> <p>ADM Inc. Architect Grant Sumile said he adjusted the development plans based on several comments that the commission made, and it was resubmitted to Planner Marisa Valenciano. Ms. Valenciano said the applicant revised the development plans prior to the October 6, special onsite meeting to allow the commission time to review, form comments and prepare for an action on this project at the October 6, meeting.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano advised the commission for a motion to receive the communication.</p> | Mr. Guerber moved to receive the memorandum from ADM Inc. dated August 5, 2022 to transmit revised preliminary plans for Sueoka market for the commission to review prior to the October special onsite meeting. Ms. Remoaldo seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0 |
| <b>G. Unfinished Business</b> | Mr. Hull said there were no unfinished business.  |   |
| <b>H. New Business</b>        | <p><b>H.1. Gay &amp; Robinson, Inc. – Kaumakani Avenue</b><br/> <b>Proposed demolition and proposed reconstruction of two existing single-family residences</b><br/>         Tax Map Key: (4) 1-7-006:001</p>   |   |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION  | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|
|         | <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. Kaumakani, Hawai'i</p> <p>a. Director's report pertaining to this matter.</p> <p>Mr. Hull asked if anyone in person wanted to testify on this agenda item, hearing none, he asked if anyone online wanted to testify to raise their digital hand. Mr. Hironaka confirmed there were no additional attendees online.</p> <p>Planner Marisa Valenciano apologized to the commission for the late receipt of the directors' report;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Read the Director's Report dated August 18, 2022.</li> <li>• The commission's action for the project was to;             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Support the project as represented</li> <li>2.Recommend approval of the project with conditions of approval</li> <li>3.Recommend denying the permits</li> <li>4.Recommend deferring action on the permits</li> </ol> </li> <li>• The department recommended Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission (KHPRC) support the proposed demolition and the proposed reconstruction of House #415 and #435 with the following conditions.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Reconstruct the homes in the same orientation and placement of the original homes.</li> <li>2.Where feasible, consider using the original materials for the character defining windows and doors of the two structures.</li> <li>3.Prior to demolition take interior and exterior photos of both structures and submit to the department for its record.</li> </ol> </li> </ul> <p>Gay &amp; Robinson, Inc. Real Estate Director Koa Duncan and Gay &amp; Robinson, Inc. Vice President Howard Green did not have any presentation or updates.</p> |        |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION   | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
|         | <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Guerber asked if they planned to rebuild from scratch. Mr. Green confirmed they plan to rebuild from scratch.</li> <li>• Mr. Guerber asked if they plan to use materials available today. Mr. Green replied yes.</li> <li>• Chair Larson asked if they considered reusing the windows and doors. Mr. Green replied yes, they plan to salvage windows, fixtures, and doors before demolition.</li> <li>• Chair Larson asked if the homes contained old style tubs and fixtures. Mr. Green replied renovations were done over the years and these homes were built using low grade construction material. He doubted if any contained clawfoot tubs or antique fixtures.</li> <li>• Ms. Remoaldo asked if the homes were double walled. Mr. Green replied single wall.</li> <li>• Ms. Remoaldo stated the photos looked like it had double walls. Mr. Green replied it could be an interior wall installed later.</li> <li>• Mr. Hull asked if they plan to rebuild with single wall. Mr. Green replied no, they cannot per county code.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Hull stated for the record it was important to recognize the large bay windows in the living room was a unique character defined trait of the structure. He asked that they use similar materials and strongly reuse the existing windows and doors, if possible. Mr. Green replied that they would not be able to reuse the windows on new construction because they do not meet ingress or egress county code.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair Larson asked if they could explain how they would deal with the possibility of not being able to reuse the windows. Mr. Green replied to meet building code they would enlarge the window size. Mr. Hull said they would follow-up with building division on the windows and doors due to the large living room window being a special feature.</li> <li>• Vice Chair Long asked if the glass windows were original or replaced. Mr. Green said most of the windows were intact and were multipaned windows. Vice Chair Long emphasized his desire to preserve the original windows.</li> <li>• Vice Chair Long asked if they could be involved and coordinate the discussion with building and planning department. Mr. Hull recommended he and Ms. Valenciano</li> </ul> |        |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION   | ACTION  |
|---------|--|---|
|         | <p>would discuss with building department and share the results with the commission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vice Chair Long asked if the commission should be involved in that conversation. Mr. Hull recommend allowing planning department to work with building and they could give a briefing on fenestration preservation code.</li> <li>• Vice Chair Long asked the agency if reusing the windows would hold them up on their development plans. Mr. Green replied it would because the condition of the windows was probably termite damaged and would be impossible to reuse.</li> <li>• Vice Chair Long asked if replacement windows would be from Home Depot. Mr. Green replied yes.</li> <li>• Vice Chair Long suggested they build a replacement window out of wood. Mr. Green replied they have a carpenter shop that could do that.</li> <li>• Vice Chair Long asked if there were any unique or special about the front doors. Mr. Green replied no.</li> <li>• Vice Chair Long asked if the front doors were made of plywood. Mr. Green replied yes.</li> </ul> <p>Vice Chair Long stated they should rebuild the windows out of real wood and use the same panes of glass. Mr. Green replied he wasn't sure how the building department code and inspectors would approve that. Mr. Hull said they would follow-up with building department. Vice Chair Long said they should defer this decision because the windows were a unique and important feature.</p> <p>Mr. Guerber commented they could move forward with demolition and preserve what they could, and he agreed with Mr. Long.</p> <p>Ms. Summers said the new energy codes would probably not approve reuse of the old windows. Vice Chair Long replied he did not ask them to use the window glass, he asked them to build the windows and use double pane glass to meet the energy code.</p> <p>Mr. Green said it would be impossible to build the same type of windows. Vice Chair Long replied maybe not the same but something similar.</p> | <p>Vice Chair Long moved to accept the presentation from Gay &amp; Robinson, Inc. – Kaumakani Avenue on the</p> |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION   | ACTION  |
|---------|--|---|
|         |  | <p>proposed demolition and proposed reconstruction of two existing single-family residences Tax Map Key: (4) 1-7-006:001 and allow the demolition to go forward as proposed and return to the commission after coordination and consultant with the Planning Department and Building Department as to how to possibly retain or onsite manufacture the windows as close to the original as possible. Mr. Guerber seconded the motion.</p> <p>Roll Call Vote:<br/>           Mr. Guerber replied Aye<br/>           Mr. Ida replied Aye<br/>           Vice Chair Long replied Aye<br/>           Ms. Remoaldo replied Aye<br/>           Ms. Summers replied Aye<br/>           Chair Larson replied Aye<br/>           Motion carried 6-Ayes and 0-Nays.</p> |
|         | <p><b>H.2. County of Kaua'i Public Works – Engineering Division</b><br/> <b>Historical Determination Request relating to the Floodplain Management Ordinance for Aloha Theatre</b><br/>           Tax Map Key (4) 1-9-004:013<br/>           Hanapēpē, Hawai'i</p> |   |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION  | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|
|         | <p>a. Director's report pertaining to this matter.</p> <p>Mr. Hull asked if anyone in person wanted to testify on this agenda item, seeing none, he asked if anyone online wanted to testify to raise their digital hand. Mr. Hironaka verified no attendees on Zoom.</p> <p>Ms. Valenciano shared the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Read portions of the Director's Report.</li> <li>• The commission's action for the project was to;             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Make a determination that the entire structure meets the historic exemption requirement</li> <li>2. Make a determination that the entire structure does not meet historic exemption requirement</li> <li>3. Make a determination that only a portion of the structure meets historic exemption requirement</li> <li>4. Defer action on the determination</li> </ol> </li> <li>• The Planning Department recommended KHPRC make a determination of the following; that the subject property as a whole is categorized as a historic property and remain on the KHPRC local inventory list and the front façade of the structure as proposed under building permit 2019-484 and building permit 2022-1597 as of August 15, 2022, retain its historic integrity or a motion that the commission defer action for the department to get further direction and analysis from an architectural historian which would provide further clarification to the applicant and the agency, Public Works.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Hull said this was the first but not the last of an agency, Public Works, requesting KHPRC to make a determination if the structure as proposed would remain historic in its entirety. The department determined that the property was historic, and the front façade was historic, but the agency needed a determination if the entire structure was historic. The front façade was the character defining feature and the primary historic trait. The reason for the determination was because of the recent change in flood codes. If the entire structure</p> |        |

| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION   | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|
|         | <p>remained historic then its exempt from the new flood codes which would mandate elevating the entire structure.</p> <p>Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair Larson asked if the commission determined that the whole structure was no longer historic would that result in the front and back being rebuilt differently. Mr. Hull replied yes, it would impact the whole building.</li> <li>• Chair Larson asked if that would include altering the façade of the building in order to meet the new flood codes. Mr. Hull replied correct.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Guerber recalled that this came before the commission, and they determined that the whole building was historic because of the front facade. Mr. Hull replied they reviewed past records and determined they could move forward because the historic front façade was being maintained and it could move forward with alterations. But it did not specifically determine whether the whole structure could be defined as historic. He said this commission could determine if the whole structure was historic and that determination would stand.</p> <p>Ms. Summers stated the steel truss system, which was part of original building had historic significance because of how tall and wide it allowed the interior space. The trusses should also be considered historic. Owner Lynn Danaher replied that the replaced roofline followed the original outline of the trusses as well as over 90% of the siding. Also original was the foundation and the concrete in front of the stage. The sides of the façade collapsed and was rebuilt, and the entire façade was finished with stucco in the old-fashioned way, the way it was before. Also original were the Aloha theatre sign and steel beam in back that possibility the theatre screen originally hung from.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Ida asked what the issue with the decertification of the levy was and assumed this triggered the whole redo. Mr. Hull replied yes and no. He said at the time the original proposal was submitted there was no issue with the levy. Subsequent to the original proposal the levy was decertified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency</li> </ul> |        |



| SUBJECT | DISCUSSION   | ACTION  |
|---------|--|---|
|         | <p>because it did not meet the standards; which made the property in a flood zone area and now subject to flood standards. This triggered a flood review and update and change in plans. With no historic exemption the structure would need to be elevated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Ida stated that this would now include all buildings along the levy and Hanapēpē Road. Mr. Hull said yes, this was the first and would not be the last.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Hull said typically an applicant would request planning department to determine if the property was historic. Planning department could determine that if it was on the inventory list, state register, national register or was 50 years old. The question for the commission on this property was if the structure in its entirety was historic. KHPRC's determination would be final and override the planning departments determination. He and Ms. Valenciano would also be following up with the Historic Hawai'i Foundation to get further clarity on this determination.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Summers asked what was not historic. Chair Larson replied rebuilding with apartments.</li> <li>• Vice Chair Long asked if this had anything to do with the 50% rule with EPW(?). Mr. Hull shook his head no.</li> <li>• Vice Chair Long asked what would happen if they determined that the structure in its entirety was historic without the addition of the apartment building or not. Mr. Hull replied that if the commission determined that the structure was historic the project would move forward as proposed and receive flood exemption.</li> <li>• Vice Chair Long asked they do not get the exemption the existing historic building would not need to be raised. Mr. Hull replied that the structure would need to be raised.</li> <li>• Vice Chair Long stated only if they do the back work. Mr. Hull said the proposal was to demolish a portion of the building and rebuild it. If the commission determines that the structure in its entirety was historic, they could proceed forward without having to meet flood standards. If the commission determines its not historic if their proposal was only to build the rear the entire structure would need to be elevated per flood code.</li> </ul> | <p>Vice Chair Long moved to accept this proposal and determine that the building historic in its entirety for the</p> |

| SUBJECT   | DISCUSSION   | ACTION  |
|---|--|---|
|   | <p>Chair Larson commented to keep the structure historic it was important to pay particular attention to the parts that are historic and that the details of the façade are followed as closely as possible.</p>   | <p>purposes of demolition and rehabilitation for hotel. Ms. Summers seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p>  |
| <p><b>I. Executive Session</b></p>                                | <p>Mr. Hull<br/>         The Commission did not enter executive session.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>1. Announcements</b></p>                                    | <p>Mr. Hull announced the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commissioners invited to a Hawai'i Congress of Planning Officials conference September 14-16, 2022, and to RSVP with Marissa.</li> <li>• October 6, Sueoka Store site visit special meeting and time to be determined.</li> <li>• October 20, regular commission meeting.</li> <li>• Chair Larson not available for October 6 meeting</li> </ul> |   |
| <p><b>2. Selection of Next Meeting Date and Agenda Topics</b></p> | <p>Next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, October 13, 2022 Special Meeting and October 20, 2022 Regular Meeting</p>  |   |
| <p><b>7. Adjournment</b></p>                                      | <p>With no further business to conduct, Chair Larson called for a motion to adjourn.</p>   | <p>Mr. Ida moved to adjourn the meeting. <i>Inaudible</i> seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p> <p>Chair Larson adjourned the meeting at 2:42 p.m.</p> |

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

- Approved as circulated. 02/16/23  
 Approved with amendments. See minutes of \_\_\_\_\_ meeting.