CHARTER 343, HRS
Environmental Assessment/Determination
Negative Declaration

Recorded Owner : Gilbert and Cheryl Chavez
Applicant/ Agent : AM Partners, Inc.
Location : 41-543 Kalanianaole Hwy., Waimanalo, Oahu
Tax Map Key : 4-1-02: 02
Request : Shoreline Setback Variance, After-the-Fact
Proposal : Side Yard Wall Within the Shoreline Setback
Determination : A Negative Declaration is Issued

Attached and incorporated by reference is the Environmental Assessment prepared by the Applicant for the project. Based on the significance criteria outlined in Chapter 200, State Administrative Rules, we have determined that preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Very truly yours,

DONALD A. CLEGG
Director of Land Utilization
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
CHAVEZ AFTER-THE-FACT FENCE WALL RECONSTRUCTION VARIANCE

I. PROJECT SUMMARY

Project Name: Chavez After-the-Fact Fence Wall Reconstruction Variance

Applicant & Agent: AM Partners, Inc.
1164 Bishop Street, Suite 1000
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Attn: Charles K.C. Lau, AIA

Recorded Fee Owner: Gilbert and Cheryl Chavez
1149 Danbury Drive
San Jose, California 95129

Accepting Authority: Department of Land Utilization
City and County of Honolulu

Tax Map Key: 4-1-02:2

Lot Area: 15,143 Square Feet

Project Location: 41-543 Kalanianaoe Highway
Waimanalo, Oahu, Hawaii

State Land Use Designation: Urban

Development Plan Designation: Residential

Zoning: R-10

Agencies Consulted: Department of Land Utilization
II. PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

General Characteristics:
The applicant is requesting a shoreline setback variance to allow the retention of a reconstructed six foot high and sixteen foot long CRM fence wall located between the subject property and Kaiona Beach Park. The project area was formerly secured by a non-conforming concrete block fence on a CRM foundation wall. This concrete block fence was demolished to the base CRM wall and subsequently replaced by a new, all CRM wall.

Technical Characteristics:
The project area is located on the mauka-Lanikai side of the project property. The action in request of the subject variance consist of a CRM wall sixteen feet in length, six feet in height, and approximately eighteen inches in width. The fence is six feet in height over the finished grade of the lot. The fence is of approximately the same dimensions as the previous non-conforming fence with the exception of construction materials.

Economic Characteristics:
The value of the reconstructed portion of the project fence is below $65,000. The cost of the improvement was totally borne by the land owner.

Social Characteristics:
The project is not expected to have any adverse social impacts to adjacent beach users since it replaces a fence of similar dimensions and does not further restrict public beach user views or accessibility.

Environmental Characteristics:
The subject project is not expected to increase environmental impacts since it is a replacement fence of approximately the same dimensions as the former concrete block fence. The subject improvement will not have any impact on the existing shoreline processes. There will not be any additional physical or visual encroachment beyond those associated with the previous fence structure.

Aesthetically, the project provides a visually improved fence consistent with the remainder of the fence line.

III. SUMMARY OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The subject project is located immediately adjacent to the certified shoreline of the project lot. Within the project lot are a landscaped grass yard and swimming pool. Along the public park side of the fence, is a small grassed area bounded by a low CRM seawall. A drainage swale opening through the seawall is located near the property boundary on the grassed area.
The subject project provides a physical barrier between the project parcel and the adjacent public beach park. The beach fronting the beach park seawall is covered with boulders, spall material and concrete piles, all used to mitigate erosion. This seawall area can be considered dangerous since there is no sandy beach access immediately makai of the wall.

IV. SUMMARY OF MAJOR IMPACTS

Short-term Impacts:
No short-term impacts are expected for this after-the-fact application.

Long-term Impacts:
The fence is not expected to have any impact on the shoreline. The fence has been constructed entirely above the high water mark and certified shoreline and constitutes a replacement of a similar structure.

Traffic, air, and noise conditions have not been affected by the project. Nor have archaeology, flora or fauna been affected by the implementation of the project.

Visually, the project has improved the appearance of the Kaiona Beach Park parking area by providing a uniform and attractive CRM fence rather than the previous patchwork mix of wood fencing, unfinished concrete block and CRM wall.

V. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The applicant is presently requesting an after-the-fact variance for a replacement fence. The subject action was undertaken to replace a structure which was inadvertently demolished during the construction of improvements to the adjacent seawall. No alternatives were considered prior to the subject project since it was not the landowners intent to demolish the subject portion of the fence.

An optional wall configuration is presently being explored as an alternative to the existing non-conforming structure. This optional configuration would retain the safety advantage of a non-scaleable wall extension, but at a lower height. With it’s 7 foot 6 inch length, this section of fence wall will restrict access to the open fencing section. This section would be limited to 4 feet in height (Drawing A-4) over the existing finish grade. The remaining 7 foot 6 inch section would be fenced to match the adjoining the makai seawall and fence. This plan is shown in Drawing A-5. This option, if selected, will minimize view impacts from the mauka and park directions and will maintain the public safety features of the existing full length lava rock fence.
VII. PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES

Proper maintenance by the owner will be conducted to insure the physical integrity and safety of the fence to both public park users and the landowner. No other mitigation is expected to be required for this after-the-fact action.
Figure 3: "Before" view of fence from parking lot. (11/89)

Figure 4: "After" view of fence from parking lot. (2/93)
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Figure 1: "Before" view of fence from the beach. (11/89)

Figure 2: "After" view of fence from the beach. (2/93)
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Figure 5: View mauka towards fence and beach park. (2/93)

Figure 6: Close view of beach park’s seawall fronted by boulders, spall material and concrete piles. (2/93)
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SECTION THROUGH FENCE