

COUNTY OF KAUA'I
Minutes of Meeting
OPEN SESSION

DRAFT To Be Approved

Board/Commission:	Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission	Meeting Date	May 16, 2024
Location	Mo'ikeha Meeting Room 2A/2B	Start of Meeting: 1:00 p.m.	End of Meeting: 1:59 p.m.
Present	Chair Susan Remoaldo. Vice Chair Lee Gately. Commissioners: Chucky Boy Chock, Kathleen Kukuchi-Samonte, Carolyn Larson (<i>in at 1:03 p.m.</i>), Sandi Quinsaas, and Victoria Wichman. Deputy County Attorney Stephen Hall. Planning Department Staff: Deputy Director Jodi A. Higuchi Sayegusa, Planner Marisa Valenciano, and Secretary Duke Nakamatsu. Office of Boards and Commissions: Boards and Commissions Administrator Ellen Ching and Commission Support Clerk Arleen Kuwamura.		
Excused			
Absent			

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
A. Call to Order	Chair Remoaldo called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.	
B. Roll Call	Deputy Planning Director Jodi A. Higuchi Sayegusa verified attendance by roll call: Commissioner Chock replied here. Commissioner Kikuchi-Samonte replied here. Commissioner Larson was excused at the roll call (<i>in at 1:03 p.m.</i>). Commissioner Quinsaas replied here. Commissioner Wichman replied here. Vice Chair Gately replied here. Chair Remoaldo replied here. Chair Remoaldo reminded Commissioners to state their name prior to making any motion.	Quorum was established with six Commissioners present.
C. Approval of the Agenda	Vice Chair Gately Chair Remoaldo requested to amend the agenda to move item E. General Business to the position of H. New Business and move item H. New Business to the position of E. General Business.	Vice Chair Gately moved to approve the agenda, as circulated. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wichman. Vice Chair Gately moved to amend the agenda to move item

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		<p>H.2. before H.1. Ms. Wichman seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.</p> <p>A vote on the main motion as amended was taken and carried 6:0.</p>
D. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting(s) of the KHPRC	March 21, 2024 Meeting Minutes	Vice Chair Gately moved to approve the March 21, 2024 Meeting Minutes. Ms. Quinsaot seconded the motion. Motion carried 6:0.
E. General Business	There was no General Business on the Commission's agenda.	
F. Communications	There were no Communications on the Commission's agenda.	
G. Unfinished Business	There was no Unfinished Business on the Commission's agenda.	
	There being no objections, item H.2 was taken out of order pursuant to the amended agenda.	
H. New Business	<p>2. <u>HRT Realty LLC/Harry & Jeanette Weinberg Foundation Inc. C/O CBRE Dr. Kuhn's Former Residence Preliminary conceptual plans for the proposed demolition and reconstruction of an existing historic structure</u> <u>Tax Map Keys: (4) 3-7-001:033 and (4) 3-7-001:034</u> <u>Property Address: 4460 and 4480 Ahukini Road</u> <u>Līhu'e, Hawai'i</u></p> <p><u>Consideration of a zoning permit for the proposed demolition of an existing structure and the proposed reconstruction of a structure to a neighboring adjacent site.</u></p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Deputy Director Higuchi Sayegusa paused for public testimony. There was no one present in the public wishing to testify on this agenda item.</p> <p><i>Ms. Larson was noted as present at 1:03 p.m.</i></p> <p>Ms. Valenciano welcomed back returning Commissioners and new Commissioner Chock. She further stated that there is no Director's Report for this specific item. This is a preliminary report and the applicant wanted to present an update on the work that they are doing on the property. There are no permits in the queue. This briefing is based on the applicant wanting to receive feedback from the Commission early on in their project. The applicants were present to provide an overview. Meeting packets included conceptual site plans. Omitted from the meeting packets were detailed plans, elevations, floor plans, etc. as the applicant is not at that point in the project. The applicant wanted to provide ideas for their property and to receive some preliminary feedback, reactions, or design considerations that could help to facilitate discussion for the work that they want to formally present at a future meeting of the Commission.</p> <p>Your Commission heard from Ryan Gilbert, Director of Asset Management, Harry & Jeanette Weinberg Foundation, Inc., and Rene Matsumura, Architect and Master Planner, G70. Mr. Gilbert thanked the Commission for their time and provided a presentation for the Commission as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Harry & Jeanette Weinberg Foundation has been in existence for over 30 years to help those most impoverished and in need. • Mr. Weinberg set up the foundation with quite a bit of real estate assets that he held in the state. • The asset base that generates cash flow is what is used to provide for grants that are distributed to various charitable organizations that are carrying out the mission of the Foundation throughout the state. • In Hawai'i, the Foundation has given out over \$400 million to various charities that are doing educational work, addressing housing affordability, healthcare, etc. • Mr. Gilbert has been with the foundation for 5 years and is responsible for the island of 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Kaua'i.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Foundation started its real estate team in 2018-2019. • Part of the mission of the Foundation was to inject capital into assets under the Foundation to continue to create additional cashflow to carry out the mission. • As part of the process, assets were evaluated based on not having had any upgrades or capital put into them for years. • Mr. Weinberg bought many of the assets he owned in the 1970s or 1980s. • The Weinberg Foundation has approximately 40 assets on Kaua'i. Some assets were sold off leaving the Weinberg Foundation with approximately 30 assets to-date on Kaua'i. • The Foundation owns properties on both sides of the road on Ahukini Road from Kūhiō Highway to Hardy Street. • With the amount of traffic and looking at the Līhu'e Town Core Plan, the Foundation saw that there was an opportunity at this project location. • The Foundation hired Group 70 and Ms. Matsumura, a Kaua'i girl, to help them evaluate various options for improving their Ahukini properties. • After evaluating the options provided by Group 70, the projects stalled for a while as the Foundation sorted through the cost-benefit tradeoffs involved in the various options, including redevelopment, partial removal of buildings, and constructing new buildings. • The Kamani Center Building was an asset that made a lot of sense to address. • The portfolio inherited on Kaua'i included long-term ground leases. • The Kamani Center Building was on a 60-year ground lease that was reclaimed by the Foundation in 2020. • The Foundation is currently evaluating how to preserve the buildings there as they start to deteriorate and fall apart. • Initial cost estimates were in the approximate ballpark of \$1.5 million just to do minor repairs to the buildings. • Any tenant improvements would warrant the need to pull building permits to bring the structures up to current codes and would also trigger the conversion of the cesspool to a septic system. • The Foundation explored the option of possible redevelopment while keeping a replica of the current buildings on the property to satisfy the historic nature of the area. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Matsumura continued with the project briefing and provided the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project was identified as a project that the Weinberg Foundation wanted to focus on. • There are changes in the tenants now in the 5 tenant spaces. Tenant spaces are primarily single-occupancy or offices. • There are a couple of larger multi-tenant spaces. Recently, one of the real estate offices moved out. • It is difficult to lease space that is irregularly shaped for commercial properties and because of the triggering of additional upgrades if permits are pulled. • The Weinberg Foundation is present to share where they are with the property and wants to get the Commission's early feedback on plans moving forward. • The Foundation has commissioned Fung Associates, Inc. to do a historic preservation evaluation (HPE) that is currently underway. • Initial Findings and Observations were shared with the Commission to give background on information Fung Associates, Inc. found to-date. The full report will be available upon completion. • The two-story home was a physician's building that was built for the plantation. • There are a series of additional add-ons, including the single-story element towards the Lihu'e Airport. • The buildings were identified as being built between the 1920s and 1930s and is on the Kaua'i Historic Resource List, though not registered on the State or National Registries. • There was a building assessment done and the number of deferred maintenance projects, including plumbing and electrical work, replacement of windows and doors that have corroded, and termite and moisture damage to the exterior was significant. • Approximately 40% of the exterior of the building would need to be replaced as a part of the renovation. • Any permits that are applied for would trigger upgrades to the infrastructure. • The Weinberg Foundation is at a point in the project planning where it needs to decide how to move forward with providing commercial space for local businesses. • There is currently a \$1.5 million cost estimate for renovations and that does not include costs for the installation of a septic system to remove the cesspool. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is currently no sewer lateral to the site to connect to the County’s sewer system. • The building is a major focal point for visitors and residents as they leave the airport area. • Of importance is to keep the kamani tree and to provide open gathering space. The space could potentially serve as a visitor’s center that could cater to visitors, including stores, cafés, etc. • The open space that is being proposed is centered around the kamani tree. The kamani tree is not on the property but is on the State’s Right-of-Way. • The hope is to recreate a building that is purpose-built and more commercially functional and viable for local businesses to operate within. • For the two-story building, the plan is to not provide a second story of occupiable space due to the need to install an elevator within the structure. • Massing and character are things that will be incorporated in the new building, but in a more commercially viable way. <p>Vice Chair Gately inquired about the right-of-way and the realignment of Ahukini Road. He asked if that was a remnant of another project. Ms. Matsumura responded that in various community plans, there have been plans to reflect a realignment of Ahukini Road to align with the road that goes towards Isenberg Park between the parcel owned by the Weinberg Foundation and Walmart. She stated that the last discussion that occurred regarding that realignment occurred in 2021 and at that time there were no immediate plans to move forward with that.</p> <p>Ms. Larson expressed her excitement that the applicant has such a great opportunity with that historic building given its location and history. Ms. Larson framed the question before the Commission as one about whether support is for the demolition of the building or whether restoration of the building is preferred. Ms. Larson stated that a replica of the building is not the same as restoring it. She stated that she hears and understands the financial considerations that the applicant has, however, as the building has been in the hands of the same owner for over 50 years, the building owner could have used some of the money made for restoration purposes over time. She further stated that the buildings are some of the few buildings that help to tell the store of the Līhu‘e Plantation. Līhu‘e Plantation built the town of Līhu‘e. Ms. Larson supports the visitor’s center concept as it is much needed for the town. The building could be used to interpret</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>features of the town or historical landmarks such as the kamani tree. The building itself has a story to tell and an important story about the history of healthcare and the mill. Ms. Larson encouraged the applicant to pursue the route of historic preservation and to view the buildings as an asset for future commercial use. She stated that history cannot be built.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo inquired about the costs associated with trying to save the building. She asked whether any consideration was given to moving the building one lot over. She noted that the windows were changed over time, but mention was made about the windows being 6 over 6. She also noted that the Commission was hearing for the first time that a second story was not being considered, and that was what makes the building interesting as there are very few two-story historical buildings. Chair Remoaldo also pointed out that the building also has an iconic fireplace which made the building memorable. She further asked whether there were materials within the interior of the buildings which could be salvaged and reused in the new building, including floors, staircase, bannisters, etc. Chair Remoaldo stated that she has seen photographs of the interior of the building and wondered if there were any knobs, hinges, light fixtures, switch pulls, or light plates that could be salvaged as those did not stand out in the photographs. She further stated that she was glad that the kamani tree would remain and become a focal point of the properties. She also mentioned that the kamani tree was Kaua'i's first exceptional tree on Kaua'i's List of Exceptional Trees.</p> <p>Ms. Larson stated that through her experience, if you get a regular contractor to go to an older building and ask them how much it will cost to restore the building, they do not have the same sense as a historic preservation contractor who has the experience on what to do. She also noted that in general, most contractors want to build new buildings, but historic preservation contractors have tools on how to preserve features of buildings in their toolbox. She recommended that the applicant check with a historic preservation contractor on the cost items. Ms. Larson also mentioned the tax advantages with historic properties, but the applicant stated that those tax relief measures did not pertain to this specific project.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately asked whether the applicant had gone through the possibility of having the property shut down for restoration. He stated that he understands the work involved in restoring a property which is immense but asked the applicant whether they have had those discussions.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Gilbert responded that when they received a report of the items that needed to be fixed, they saw a list of items that could be created by looking at the deteriorating building. However, when the Foundation investigated making the various repairs, that was done with the understanding that there would be additional costs for other items necessary to make the initial repairs. He noted the \$1.5 million estimate was strictly for the highlighted items that needed to be done and did not include any of the additional repairs or cost items that could be revealed when making the initial repairs. He further stated that the Foundation had considered just letting the building sit as-is because the building cannot be occupied safely, though the preferred avenue is to use the building as an economic driver for the area by having a visitor's center, create additional parking, be the start of a walkable community, etc.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately asked if the applicant had a price estimate for the construction of a new facility. Mr. Gilbert responded that they received a bid to construct a new building replica of the old, but without a second floor of occupiable space. Second floor space is not as attractive to commercial tenants, brings in less rental revenue, and triggers the need for elevators or access to the second floor. The concept was to keep the general façade of the building with high bay ceilings without the added costs of second floor space, restrooms, etc.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately asked if residential units could be constructed on the second floor. Mr. Gilbert responded that the properties are zoned as General Commercial and that it may need a waiver to do so. Vice Chair Gately stated that the Kōloa Village Shopping Center has residential units for residents and shop owners above the storefronts. Ms. Matsumura stated that the space on the second floor is a relatively small space and only approximately 1,000 square feet.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately stated that he had done research on this particular property approximately four years ago and there is community interest from family members who were related to doctors who worked in that building or who spent their childhood days in the building. The building became a Territorial Office and then a State Office building before it was merged with some of the dispensary structures moved next to it. There is still community memory of the old building. Vice Chair Gately reiterated what Ms. Larson mentioned about losing the history of the building and not being able to simply rebuild it through a replica. Vice Chair Gately asked if the applicant had the intention of putting a chimney in the building. Mr. Gilbert responded that a chimney</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>could be a part of the design plans. Ms. Matsumura stated that if a replica is built, the building would keep many of the exterior features that it currently has. She further noted that one exterior change may be to clean up the number of accessible ramps around the building. She also noted that adding in a smokestack or false fireplace could be designed into the replica building.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately inquired whether the cesspool would ultimately need to be changed out. Ms. Matsumura responded that it would have to be changed at some point.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo stated that a motion can be made to receive the written and verbal report from the applicant for the record. Ms. Larson asked whether the Commission should consider a site visit. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that a site visit could be conducted as a body or individually. However, this agenda item was meant as a preliminary preview of the project with the applicant returning once plans have been finalized or at a further developmental stage. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa also noted that a site visit could possibly be planned closer to the time this item returns to the Commission's agenda. Mr. Hall stated that site visits for entire boards or commissions entail a lot of work and given that the Office of Boards and Commissions is short-staffed, that might be a hard ask of the Office of Boards and Commissions.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately stated that since the building is open to the public for business use, the members could go visit the site and surrounding area at their leisure. Mr. Gilbert noted that a representative from the Foundation would be happy to walk members around the properties.</p> <p>Ms. Matsumura asked whether feedback would be given to the applicant after an Executive Session. Mr. Hall clarified that no Executive Session would be held for this item as those are only done when legal issues arise and for non-public discussions. His understanding is that this is just a preliminary informational briefing so does not anticipate the need to go into Executive Session.</p> <p>Ms. Matsumura stated that the applicant is at a point where they need to decide on which way to proceed in terms of restoring the building or constructing a replica, and whether there is support for either option. She also noted that surveys and studies hinge on the feedback received from the Commission. Ms. Matsumura asked the Commission if they could provide feedback as to</p>	<p>Vice Chair Gately moved to receive the written and verbal report for the record, along with a potential future site visit as a group or individually. Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte seconded the motion.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>whether there is support for any or all parts of the current planned remediation of the building.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately stated that it is hard for him to make any concrete recommendations as there are no detailed plans or detailed information to base those decisions off. He noted that he would like the history and details to be preserved as much as possible, but it is difficult to provide any recommendations or feedback as there are no details on what the new replication is going to look like.</p> <p>Ms. Matsumura thanked the Commission and offered to put together more detailed information for the Commission's review, if requested.</p> <p>Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte agreed with Vice Chair Gately. She is not supportive of the demolition of the building and would like to see as many original features restored or reused in the new building. Mr. Gilbert stated that the requests being made are not unreasonable and further noted that the plan is to do a replica of the current building. Mr. Gilbert stated that there may be many items such as light switches or boxes that could be salvaged and put into the replica but was unsure what was salvageable so that the Commission could endorse the plan to construct a replica of the building. He also expressed to the Commission that he had hoped to receive general feedback on the proposal so that he could then get more detailed plans completed, though it does increase the cost of the project should there be no clear direction.</p> <p>Ms. Larson stated that there are contradictions in a replica and the definition of what that means for the building. She noted that moving away from having a second story moves the building far away from being a replica. Mr. Gilbert stated that the roof height would remain the same, the second-floor interior would just not be built out. Ms. Larson responded that the building asset exists, and she would prefer to see the building restored and repaired as opposed to it being demolished for a replica. She noted that the goals can be met with the historic asset left intact, and the goals of the Commission realized. Ms. Larson asked that Vice Chair Gately and Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte withdraw their motion so that she could propose a new motion.</p> <p>Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte laid out the various options including preserving the building or letting the building sit there and fall apart. She stated that she understood the financial considerations that</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>need to be considered as well. She noted that the investment needs to be viable so that the asset feeds back into the parent company so that they can continue to do good things for the community. She further noted that if the Commission does not make concessions and comes to a middle ground, the building could just sit and fall apart benefitting none of the involved parties. She stated that she would rather see some parts of the building salvaged through a replica than to see nothing saved and the building left to ruins like the Wilcox Building by the Puakea Golf Course. Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte asked whether the applicant considered the option of letting the building fall to the ground if no decision was made to proceed. Mr. Gilbert responded that that is an option, but not one that the applicant hopes to have happened.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo asked whether the Commission wanted to withdraw the original motion in lieu of a new motion. Mr. Hall stated that the original motion could be amended or withdrawn to give the Commission a clean slate. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that a vote on the motion could also be called to see where the votes land.</p> <p>Mr. Hall stated that the Commission could provide a letter to the applicant later which outlines what the Commission would like to see from the applicant as a part of the “restoration” of the building.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked the applicant whether encouragement to embark on the restoration path was helpful to provide them with guidance to move forward and asked if the applicant needed more specific details. Ms. Matsumura stated that they would like to return to share the final HPE that Fung Associates, Inc. was preparing to provide more detail on what elements of the structure are original. There were a lot of pieces that were replaced and additions that were added on. Ms. Matsumura stated that perhaps at that time, the Commission can then provide more specific recommendations on what restoration of the building may look like. Ms. Matsumura noted that the estimated restoration costs of \$1.5 million along with another \$500,000 for the cesspool replacement, the second story of the building will be uninhabitable due to ADA accessibility issues and other structural considerations. Without the restoration, three tenants on the bottom floor would be affected by the reinvestment in the restoration efforts of the building. The leases would have to bear some of the renovation improvements. Ms. Matsumura suggested differing specifics on the definition of restoration and what that may look like until Fung Associates, Inc.</p>	<p>Vice Chair Gately withdrew his motion. Ms. Kikuchi-Samonte withdrew her second.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>completes the HPE. Ms. Larson concurred that the research is going to inform what features exist and what era restoration will be to. Ms. Larson also mentioned that it would be hard for the Commission to give further details on what they would like to see restored when there are no details of what even exists. Historical appropriateness and adaptive reuse are options and considerations for the Commission and the applicant to review at a future date based on the information received through the HPE. She suggested the applicant return to the Commission once details and the HPE are received.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately stated that he has materials through his own research that he could provide to the applicant through the Planning Department's staff. Ms. Matsumura stated that she would greatly appreciate that.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked whether the Wilcox History Book contained information about Dr. Kuhns and the building. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that the Department can facilitate an information exchange through Ms. Valenciano.</p>	<p>Ms. Larson moved to encourage the applicant to pursue restoration of the building. Ms. Quinsaas seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0.</p>
	<p>There being no objections, item H.1 was taken out of order pursuant to the amended agenda.</p>	
	<p><u>H.1. County of Kaua'i Former Big Save Building Proposed Conversion and Alteration of the former Big Save grocery store to a Pi'ikoi Youth Center</u> <u>Tax Map Key: (4) 3-6-005:027</u> <u>Property Address: 4444 Rice Street, Suite #301</u> <u>Lihu'e, Hawai'i</u></p> <p><u>Consideration of a zoning permit for the proposed exterior and interior renovations for the proposed conversion of the former Big Save Space to a Youth Center.</u></p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p data-bbox="436 297 1020 329"><u>a. Director's Report pertaining to this matter.</u></p> <p data-bbox="359 358 1272 391">There was no one present from the public to testify on this agenda item.</p> <p data-bbox="359 422 1188 454">There being no objections, the meeting was recessed at 1:56 p.m.</p> <p data-bbox="359 485 1335 518">There being no objections, the meeting was called back to order at 2:00 p.m.</p> <p data-bbox="359 548 1245 581">Ms. Valenciano stated the following in her report to the Commission:</p> <ul data-bbox="407 581 1566 1442" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="407 581 1566 678">• The action before the Commission is the consideration of zoning permits regarding the proposed conversion, as well as renovation and alteration, of the former Big Save Shopping Center, into a proposed youth center. <li data-bbox="407 678 1566 776">• The Director's Report went into extensive detail and research summarizing the zoning permit history, as well as analyzing some of the historical photos the Department found in coordination with the Kaua'i Historical Society and Vice Chair Gately. <li data-bbox="407 776 1272 808">• There are both exterior and interior renovations that are proposed. <li data-bbox="407 808 1566 906">• The main exterior renovations will include the addition of the clerestory at the opening of the building with glass windows and doors on the Eiwa Street side of the building and the reroof of a portion of the building with clay shingle roof tiles. <li data-bbox="407 906 1566 971">• The subject property is fifty years of age and maybe eligible as a potential historical district or even contributing building specifically under criteria "A" and criteria "C." <li data-bbox="407 971 1566 1068">• The subject property has had some alterations and additions, but it could be argued that it still has retained some aspects of historical integrity such as the feeling and association that still make it recognizable as the former Lihu'e Shopping Center. <li data-bbox="407 1068 1566 1133">• There may be some materials that may be original based on historical photos that were provided in the exhibits, but that is something to further explore. <li data-bbox="407 1133 1566 1230">• The proposed improvements could be perceived as having an effect on this historic property, especially if the building was to be nominated onto the Register as part of a historic district. <li data-bbox="407 1230 1566 1377">• In the proposal, the applicant has included in the cover letter that the clerestory roof addition was proposed to provide more natural light into the space. Alternative designs were considered such as eliminating the roof addition and utilizing the existing space, or even looking at a proposed open-air courtyard like the Rotunda. For various reasons, those alternative designs were not pursued. <li data-bbox="407 1377 1566 1442">• The building permit is what is provided in the plans. The Department would recommend that the Commission provide comments or any design feedback that could help shape the 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>proposed project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Right now, the building permit is in the queue. • Any design feedback or considerations would be most helpful at this point in the process. • Marc Ventura is the applicant’s representative and was present to answer any questions from the Commission. <p>Your Commission heard from Marc Ventura as he shared the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When this project was started, it was an interesting project from his perspective. • His firm has done a lot of work over the years on the building, including the “fishbowl” workforce area, hurricane hardening at the Pi’ikoi Building, and years ago, an interior renovation for the IT Division. • The space sat empty for many years. • During a site evaluation, it was determined that there were a lot of roofing problems in the building including drainage and leaking. • The fire separation wall between the Fire Department and the rest of the building is half-done. • Big Save closed in 2011. • The space is close to 20,000 square feet. • The space is a dark cave. The task for his firm was to figure out how to use that space. • The building itself is comprised of a lot of walls and it does not bode well for current codes that mandate natural light getting to the spaces. • The premise is to use the building for daycare, early childhood development, and elderly care. • The firm started with programmatic requirements from the State agencies that oversee the programs prior to designing the interior of the building to ensure that those requirements were met. • There were certain minimum requirements that needed to be met regarding lighting. • Opening the space to more natural lighting was the main driver in the rest of the design for this project. • Details for the spaces for the elderly care component were not provided. • Having budgetary constraints, the main portion of the project was to address lighting and the roof. • The roof is a drastic design element, but the Pi’ikoi Building lobby roof set a precedent to follow. The opening of the roof allowed air and light into the middle area of the space. • The entryway is now focused on the Eiwa Street side of the building as opposed to its current location on the north-side of the building. 	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Larson stated that the plans provided by the applicant are confusing to her. Mr. Ventura stated that the building itself is a confusing building. Ms. Larson further stated that a visit to the location would be helpful for her to understand where different changes are being proposed. Ms. Larson noted that she is interested in the history of the building, including what portions of the complex are still the original building as opposed to having been renovated. She further noted that she wanted to know what pieces of the original building design still exist and what are the main features being proposed and how will it change the building. Mr. Ventura stated that the building has changed a lot from the original building. The courtyard area is completely different. Mr. Ventura stated that Ms. Valenciano listed the various building permits for the building over the years and those might shine light on the different improvements or renovations that were made. He stated that the changes being proposed with the glass and stone were meant to mimic the coral stone elements that are currently part of the building. Mr. Ventura was uncertain about the roof as various modifications were made over the years. The proposal includes the clay tile, which is more expensive, and this was a part of a recent renovation as there is a stack of leftover material when Beachside Roofing re-did a portion of the roof. The current roofing material over the space is made of brittle material that is breaking apart and is a big part of why the leaks are happening.</p> <p>Ms. Larson inquired whether the original roofing material was known. Mr. Ventura stated that he did not know. He further explained that the entire building will not be reroofed, only the portion over the Big Save space along with a small portion towards the east to try to blend the roofing areas together. From afar, the roof looks like it is made of one material, but there are two different types of roofing material currently that look very similar to each other.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately stated that having looked at the photographs provided, the edge of the building being re-done used to most likely be a loading zone area for the grocery store. Mr. Gately appreciated the artistic renderings currently on the building, but stated that when the temporary skatepark was added, the view from the Historic County Building drastically changed. The artistic renderings provided by the applicant were very attractive to Mr. Gately, including those on page A.4.2. He also likes the profile of the new roofline as it mimics parts of the old structure. He understands the need for more windows for transforming the space from a grocery store to its proposed use. Vice Chair Gately wondered where the skatepark was going to go if the renovations of the space moved forward. Vice Chair Gately supported the rendering and versions of plans that he has seen as proposed.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that there is a new proposal site a new skatepark in the Nāwiliwili area.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked whether the current plan for the Līhu‘e Town Core called for a community center at the proposed location. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa confirmed that the plan called for the siting of a youth center within the building. Ms. Larson asked whether the youth center was a part of the Līhu‘e Town Core Plan. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa responded that the Līhu‘e Town Core Urban Design Plan called for the area to be for civic center uses, and that a youth center could be considered complementary in that it is a civic use. Ms. Valenciano stated that there have been a lot of different plans for the proposed project site. Ms. Valenciano could not recall what the most recent plans called for but did confirm what Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated about the location being for civic center uses.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked what the future use of the space would be. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that the proposal is for a youth center to occupy the space. Ms. Larson inquired about the likelihood that government offices would need to expand into the space. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that in the proposed annual budget, there is a proposal to expand office space in the Pi‘ikoi Building and in existing buildings to convert storage areas into more office space, including a new space for the Planning Department. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa also informed the Commission that there is currently a Līhu‘e Civic Center Feasibility Study that is currently in the outreach process and was funded through State Capital Improvement Project Transit Oriented Development monies to look at the feasibility of redeveloping the Civic Center. She stated that a part of the plan is to look at the parking areas and whether it is feasible to site and redevelop some of the underutilized parking areas for residential housing.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked if anyone knew when the Pi‘ikoi name was given to the building. Chair Remoaldo mentioned that it might have been done during the Mayor Kusaka Administration. She further stated that the different buildings in the complex have different names.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo asked if the term white box meant an empty space. Mr. Ventura confirmed that it was just an unfinished or semi-finished space. It could represent an empty pallet which could be designed in different ways. Chair Remoaldo stated that she has questions about tenant improvements since they will be responsible for building the space that they are going to utilize and not knowing what materials or items may have been original or historic in nature. She further stated that from a design perspective, you want everything to look integrated as opposed to very disjointed. Mr. Ventura agreed with Chair Remoaldo’s sentiments but stated that the</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>County will ultimately be in control of the space and does not intend to lease the space to the public. The budgetary constraints for the space were a big factor in how the space was designed, with the need to have space for the various uses incorporated into the final design. There will be a large courtyard and there will not be demising walls between the spaces, so the area will be open.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo inquired as to whether the clay roofing tiles would be hurricane proof. Mr. Ventura stated that they would be and there is a design specification that will be included to ensure the tiles are designed for high-wind applications. Any design for the County always incorporates hurricane proofing to include windows and other possible hazards.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo asked if the hurricane proof windows would support the wall structure that is being lost due to the redesign. Mr. Ventura stated that the design of the space was engineered to be stronger than what is currently up with masonry rock and welded steel frames designed to withstand hurricane force winds.</p> <p>Mr. Chock stated that the steel design is inviting and opens the space, which might be a deterrent for the homeless population. Mr. Chock expressed his appreciation for the overall design as he recalls the space being very dark. He further stated that the different buildings in the complex are named after the Hawaiian chiefs such as Pi'ikoi and Mo'ikeha.</p> <p>Ms. Larson expressed that one of the challenges of the Commission is to determine what historical aspects of the island and of Līhu'e are important to perpetuate. Ms. Larson referenced Pat Griffin's recollection of the siting of a shopping center in the middle of Līhu'e town as being a statement of modernization for the town, which prior, had only been about sugar cane. The shopping center area transformed Līhu'e into a town and was beautifully designed to serve its purpose for many years. However, in recent years, the shopping center aspect has disappeared and now the County is wanting to transform the area into a civic center, which is needed at this time. Ms. Larson stated that the question before the Commission is how important is the building and the story is it tells about the history of Līhu'e, and how much should it be allowed to change to fit the needs of the current time period. She further stated that as time progresses, the building and its purpose may continue to change and how much of the historical significance is lost in that transition. She believes the answer is that it is going to change. Therefore, she asked whether there are certain characteristics of the original architecture that are important to salvage and perpetuate.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Ms. Larson pointed out the significance of the coral rock façade and the hope that the coral rock component was left intact in the design of the space. The more original design components are incorporated, the more contributions are made to perpetuate its history and its architect. Ms. Larson stated that the building has such a rich history, and its development and use reflects a captivating story.</p> <p>Ms. Larson asked whether the area where the windows are going is all coral rock façade right now. Mr. Ventura stated that it is a different pattern block that is covered with graffiti and art. Ms. Larson asked whether that masonry material was the original wall. Mr. Ventura stated that he believes it was the original masonry material. He also noted that the rock will be incorporated below the windowsills along with textured block. All the rock and masonry blocks were a part of the original building. Some of the areas will be replaced with windows, but the portions below the windowsills will be salvaged.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately stated that in the Director’s Report, there is a photograph of the grand opening of the Līhu‘e Food Center in the 1960s and it shows the blocks under the signage.</p> <p>Ms. Larson stated that she was focused more on the coral rock and wanted to find out how much of the rock or block pattern would be left. Mr. Ventura stated that the block pattern would be taken out of the front façade and some from the south portion of the building. The north side of the building has a wall that was built by Big Save during their expansion. Mr. Ventura stated that they did not modify the parking areas due to budgetary constraints and had to work within constraints generated by the current layout.</p> <p>Mr. Ventura explained that a portion of the skateboard wall side will be taken down. He also stated that there would be one or two panes of windows on the south side of the building facing the Kaua’i Museum. On the south side, where there is room for a generator, antenna, etc., that portion of the building is newer.</p> <p>Ms. Larson said that the block pattern is an important piece of the history of the building and asked that there be a significant representation of that in the plan. Mr. Ventura said that he would look at that more closely.</p> <p>Mr. Chock stated that he would like to see the integrity of the building kept intact. He thought that the design only affected the steel wall.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Mr. Ventura stated that large portions of the block wall may be able to be cut out and utilized on the site in the interior or elsewhere. In the front portion, there were discussions about a landscape garden or a playground off the building in safe controlled area for the children, but those could be locations for portions of the block wall. Ms. Larson thanked Mr. Ventura for that consideration and for thinking of those ideas. She mentioned that perhaps landscaping features could incorporate the block walls. Ms. Larson noted that there are ways to incorporate features of the original architectural design to tell the historical story through the redesign.</p> <p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa outlined the various options the Commission has in regard to this agenda item. She stated that the Commission could support the project as submitted, support the project but provide additional conditions that the Planning Department should consider for any permits that are forthcoming, consider recommending denial of the permits, or a deferral.</p> <p>Mr. Hall stated that if the Commission decides to support with conditions, he made note of three points during conversation which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Chock’s request to keep the integrity of the building. • Ms. Larson’s request to reflect significant representation of the block pattern in the plan. • Consider using the block pattern walls for some reuse in landscaping features or otherwise. <p>Chair Remoaldo stated that she would also like to include preserving as much of the coral rock façade as possible or using the same materials elsewhere for representation in the new design. Mr. Ventura stated that the coral rock feature is a part of the new design below the windowsills.</p> <p>Ms. Larson stated that she feels like she is not quite ready to make a recommendation and wanted to possibly ask for a deferral given the many unknowns of the defining features of the original design.</p> <p>Chair Remoaldo asked about the County’s deadlines for proceeding with this project. Mr. Ventura responded that the project has been priced and prices are escalating. He was unsure of the exact timeline, but he knows the County is moving forward with it. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa assured the Commission that Ms. Valenciano did as best a job as possible to scour the plans and history to identify what amendments were done to asses integrity of what has changed over the years and what can be defined as the character defining features of the building. The building has evolved, and it is difficult to pinpoint what happened and when. Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that she is bringing up the point to reflect that she was unsure how much more the Department would be able to decipher based on the documentation and historical records that are available.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Chair Remoaldo asked what a month deferral would mean to the project timeline. Mr. Ventura responded that he was not able to answer that question.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gately stated that he would invite Ms. Larson to make a motion to defer if she would like to, but if not, would make the motion to move forward.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		<p>Vice Chair Gately moved to recommend approval of the project with the following conditions: 1) Project keeps the integrity of the building; 2) Project keeps a significant representation of the block pattern in the plan; 3) Consider using the block pattern walls for reuse as features in landscaping or otherwise; and 4) Preserve the coral rock wall and consider reuse as much as possible. Ms. Wichman seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried 7:0.</p>
I. Executive Session	<p>There being no objections, item I. Executive Session was taken out of order.</p> <p>There was no Executive Session held.</p>	
J. Announcements	<p>There were no announcements.</p>	
K. Selection of Next Meeting Date and Agenda Topics	<p>Ms. Higuchi Sayegusa stated that June 20, 2024, is the next date for a scheduled meeting. Ms. Larson stated that she may not be present.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
L. Adjournment		Vice Chair Gately moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Quinsaat seconded the motion. Motion carried 7:0. Chair Remoaldo adjourned the meeting at 2:50 p.m.

Submitted by: _____ Reviewed and Approved by: _____
Arleen Kuwamura, Commission Support Clerk Susan Remoaldo, Chair

- () Approved as circulated.
- () Approved with amendments. See minutes of _____ meeting.