

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

Feb 10, 2014

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 some or all of the files for this meeting. I have visited some or all of the properties at issue. 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.

I register the following objections individually, in addition to 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.

Also as a general comment -- In a time of global ecological crisis, it is inexcusable to unnecessarily remove healthy trees when these trees provide a way to mitigate CO2 emissions, provide habitat for animals, and free-of-cost provide numerous other ecological benefits. It is up to your Board to tell builders and residents "no" when trees are healthy and important assets to the community, as these are.

In no cases was a tree warden report present in the files as required by village code.

25 Ash Drive -- The trees targeted in this application are extremely beautiful solid healthy thriving trees. It is absurd and profoundly unnecessary to remove them when their roots fully support the slope on which most of them are located and instead put up a "retaining wall" to 'stabilize' the slope. There is no engineering report indicating the necessity thereof. This creates a long-term cost to future owners that is unnecessary and foolhardy. The ecological loss will be significant as well as the aesthetic one. It is a very bad precedent.

11 Midwood Cross -- Two Oak trees were tagged both of which appear very healthy and important to the aesthetics of the property and surrounding ones. The file had no clear indication of the location of the trees proposed for removal and was hence defective.

78 Old Farm Road -- The application was not signed according to my notes, but my notes are a bit unreadable. There appears to be no arborist certification that trees are "dying" as asserted. The removal of oaks of diameter 30 11 and 28 inches is a significant and objectionable loss absent professional certification by a certified arborist. It appears from the application ALL oaks on the property are to be removed. This is wrong.

1 Barberry La -- The application states 6 'hemlocks' are to be removed, but it appears they are cedars. This is a serious defect in the application. In addition the assertion that 3 maples are "rotten" and the "hemlocks" are infested -- if that is the assertion -- are belied by close inspection and not attested to be a certified arborist. All those trees form a valuable screening but beyond that a place of habitat and source of oxygen etc. as stated in the village tree law. The application lacks basis and its effect will harm the community if approved.

90 Fir Drive -- The tree appears healthy. The property has already been seriously affected by tree removals. The across the street long-time neighbor Elaine Berger told me she opposes the removal and she said her arborist attested to the tree's health.

32 Woodhollow Rd -- There is no certified arborist affirmation as to the alleged state of health of the trees. And the loss of so many trees -- eight -- is objectionable and should be mitigated by changes in design of the proposed house and property.

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,

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