

Richard Brummel
Organizer, Keep East Hills Green Civic Association

Physical Address: 15 Laurel Lane
East Hills, NY 11577
Mail: PO Box 124
Greenvale NY 11548

(516) 669-1741
rbrummel@att.net

Dec. 2, 2013

Spencer Kanis, Chairman and Board Members
East Hills Architectural Review Board
East Hills Village Hall
209 Harbor Hill Rd.
East Hills, NY 11576

Dear Mr. Kanis and Board Members:

This written testimony has 3 pages.

I wish to submit this written testimony as follows for the hearing tonight.

I am an East Hills resident, having grown up here beginning in 1960 and currently residing at my childhood home at 15 Laurel Lane in Norgate.

I am an organizer of the Keep East Hills Green Civic Association, writer of the website Planet-in-Peril.org, environmental advocate, and environmental-defense litigant. I am also a resident who enjoys and spends substantial time visiting and enjoying the flora and fauna throughout the community of East Hills.

I examined the files for this meeting and visited most of the properties.

60 Crescent Lane -- Last meeting I submitted I think a letter from Gary Hsiao a direct neighbor opposing the removals. I know Richard Oberlander, an arborist, found most trees to be healthy. Your Tree Health opinion is not complete as it lacks any details whatsoever about any trees. Unless the author is present fort he board to examine UI find his letter not credible. The ARB is not a court, but some basic due process is required for a government body making decisions on a record.

I object to all applications that lack current dimensions for comparison. leaving blanks in an official application is unacceptable legally -- 25 Ash Drive, 50 Redwood Dr, 32 Woodhollow Lane and possibly 60 Crescent and 103 Willow Gate suffer from this

defect.

Also there are no required tree warden reports for ANY of the proposals requesting tree removals. That is another defect in 25 Ash Drive, 50 Redwood Dr, 32 Woodhollow Lane 60 Crescent and 103 Willow Gate.

Specific comments --

132 Wagon Road -- No information.

25 Ash Drive -- The house is far too large at 5248 sq ft. And 30 feet height. Removing multiple trees due to desire for "grading": is highly wrong. The Code calls for houses to respect topography, yet this not only destroys it but uses that as a reason to destroy trees and the environment. Removing 23 trees is scandalous. There is no arborist report on trees allegedly "storm damaged". Matthew Korn is notoriously destroying village ecology at each house he works on. The property has beautiful trees that should be preserved not destroyed.

50 Redwood Dr -- The plan to destroy 5 of 11 trees is extremely damaging the the ecology and avoidable. The loss of a 36 inch Oak is appalling. The property has beautiful trees that should be preserved not destroyed. I also find the proposed house very ugly and of the worst architectural style for East Hills. It is a common style too, as seen at 37 Laurel and elsewhere.

32 Woodhollow -- The plan to remove 6 trees is highly objectionable for ecological and aesthetic reasons. Worse is three are for the driveway. I visited the site and it appears that the cylindrical house may be demolished or the normal house; but the site as a whole is lovely and open, with a new house of 6000 sq ft it will be cramped and crass. This is not what that particular neighborhood was designed for.

I reviewed the files and visited 60 Crescent Lane. I am in general familiar with all the neighborhoods of this community from my visits in the past two years of intensive analysis and civic involvement.

103 Willow Gate -- The ARB asked for a report from an arborist but the letter submitted shows no such credentials. Again the owners want to remove multiple trees due to their roots. All trees have roots. No one has been killed by roots. Owners can add some topsoil, as arborist Richard Oberlander said, or erect some planking or live with the roots. There are no roots in midtown Manhattan; East Hills has nature, roots and all, and it is the character of this community not to be casually removed. I oppose any removals for that reason. Several trees are said to have physical defects, but the letter is not from a certified arborist. There is also no tree application. I object for those reasons.

In addition I repeat the overall 'due process' objection to all the applications noted in my letter to the village of October 30, 2012 that without full access to the property at issue the public (and experts like certified arborist Richard Oberlander -- a founding member of your Board), cannot fully knowledgeably testify to the issues at play in the various applications.

A further blanket objection is that there has been no effort apparent to place these applications for public scrutiny on the Village website as required by state law.

In my prior written testimony to you I have referenced the Village code language embracing the desire to protect the "tree canopy" for its numerous advantages and the Village code statements describing the need to preserve the neighborhood harmony and architectural quality. The objections above reflect my strong belief that these applications violate those principles in the ways specified, and/or are procedurally defective.

I further reiterate, as I did in prior testimony, that in each case where trees are to be removed, absent Tree Warden reports as specified in the ARB statute the proceedings are defective.

I urge you to uphold the laws of this Village and preserve trees and the community character and quality as the law provides. This is a policy whose neglect is resulting in massive environmental damage to East Hills and to the aesthetic degradation of the community due to overbuilding and deforestation.

I reserve the right to expand on my comments in person or otherwise. Thank you.

Sincerely,

SIGNED

Richard Brummel
Organizer, Keep East Hills Green Civic Association
516-669-1741