

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

March 17, 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.

Also, in no case was a tree warden report present in the files as required by village code.

90 Fir Drive -- Testimony in writing by Richard Oberlander and Tom Brazel who are tree specialists as indicated in their letters of testimony disputes the claim of the owner's arborist that the tree needs to be removed. It is structurally sound and if it has a borer issue that can be resolved by insecticide. The neighbor at 1-00 Chestnut values this tree and many have been lost of the property due to decisions of this board and the builder and owner.

1 Barberry Lane -- Richard Oberlander the arborist has looked at the trees and found the arguments put forth to remove them to be erroneous. First five of the six "hemlocks" are not hemlocks but instead are Eastern red cedar that cannot get woolly adelgid. And in fact none of the trees were found to be so infected -- and if they were insecticide would cure them. Further the maple trees were solid and needed only pruning. These are healthy trees that provide screening and are part of the street landscape and should be retained for aesthetic and ecological functional reasons -- they provide shed, habitat for wildlife and oxygen and protect the soil.

42 Highfield Lane -- There is no landscape plan. The 90% increase in size and ten feet increase in height may be not in keeping with the neighborhood.

118 Village Road -- I strongly object to the removal of the Maple tree for paving a new driveway. This type of loss is not justified given the pervasive loss of trees through age, construction, and disease through East Hills. The tree law was designed to prohibit such losses for avoidable elective reasons. The trees are essential to the community.

205 Elm Drive -- The additional removal of three trees is highly objectionable and should be denied. The village independent arborist contradicted the applicant on the need for removal, and even the landscape plan in the applicant's file lists all the trees as healthy. These trees should be preserved.

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.

I think the size increase for some of the houses tonight as well as the tree removals argue strongly for more detailed notification to neighbors about exactly what is being

proposed. Further the mandate in the state Open Meetings Law that files such as these be put on the internet for public access outside of office hours etc. should be followed to accurately gauge the response of residents to the proposals. My conversations with residents reveals a strong current of continued opposition and dissatisfaction with the building trend in East Hills.

Sincerely,

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