

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

(516) 669-1741
rbrummel@att.net

1-14-13

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

Dear Mr. Kanis and Board Members:

I am repeating my objections to the removal of any trees at 70 Oak Drive. As I stated in the last hearing,

Re 70 Oak Drive – This is a very significant, reckless and destructive application, asking to remove numerous healthy trees including a 26 inch diameter oak tree and many other large trees. I strongly oppose this application in its entirety, and any neighbors there do as well. I urge the ARB to deny this application fully.

This evening (12/3) I looked at the beautiful trees on the healthily wooded property and I spoke to many neighbors of 70 Oak Drive – at 25, 35, 45, 40, and 60 Oak Drive. Not one of the neighbors I spoke to had any idea so many trees were proposed for destruction by the builder, and none of them supported the proposition.

Homer Ramsey at 35 Oak Dr. was appalled at the proposal, and asked why the original footprint wasn't enough, given the vital role of trees here. Steve at 60 Oak Drive was equally opposed. Cindy at 40 Oak Drive was also opposed. The couple at 25 Oak Drive said safety may be a consideration in some cases, but just cutting trees to make space for more construction was something they definitely opposed.

70 Oak Drive is a very small plot compared to neighboring plots, at least in its street frontage. Naturally a developer wishing to maximize profit will attempt to compensate by killing greenery to expand the size of the house. That is the profit margin he counted on when purchasing the smaller house that the planner-developer of Country Estates deemed suitable for that plot. But that is no good reason to bypass the intent of the tree protection statute to “protect the tree canopy for current and future generations” and to provide numerous ecological benefits described in the Legislative Intent of the tree law (Village Code Section 186-1).

Given the late notice, the fact that the ARB official notification was generic and non-specific, it seems any of these neighbors would have spoken out but could not make the meeting on the short notice my personal efforts gave them. The village has the

resources to do much better, and should. If the board does not feel comfortable denying the application given its current information, I ask that the board defer decision until neighbors can be formally interviewed, and until a formal report can be rendered on the impact of the tree removals on the local ecology.

To add to that, a new email from the applicant asks leave to destroy three trees at this point, all deciduous and ranging from 26 inches to somewhat less. I viewed these trees today; they are the dominant trees on the left side of the property. They are healthy beautiful trees.

We have lost do many trees under your watch we simply cannot afford to lose more. i have driven around East Hills to look at the properties under review tonight and this area has been denuded by every new development. we cannot afford to continue this disgraceful approach. Already the largest trees were cut down on this property. Enough!

Re 27 Midwood Cross – I read the plans and find the developer asking permission to cut down a 15 inch diameter tree. I find this highly objectionable and ask you to deny it. In building a new house, the developer has high degree of flexibility in its siting and design that should allow full compliance with the intent of the village tree law -- to protect the canopy and preserve mature trees for their multiple ecological benefits (see Village Code Section 186-1).

Further the proposed house is more than double the size of the current one, but you may not know that because the application is incomplete.

These large houses are a blight that do not fit the neighborhoods, and have destroyed the balance in many areas, including further down Midwood Cross (toward Harbor Hill Rd, south). Stop this here. Keep houses proportional to existing and current houses. Force this designer back to do so.

5 Estates Drive

The plans are not clear what is being planned in relation to the current site.

205 Elm Dr

Similar to 27 Midwood Cross, the proposal is for more than a 100% increase in size. this is far too much, despite the fact many properties in East Hills have seen this type of overdevelopment already. Our lots do not suport that if we want to preserve the neighborhood character you are lawfully required to work toward.

These large houses are a blight that do not fit the neighborhoods, and have destroyed the balance in many areas, including further down Midwood Cross (toward Harbor Hill Rd, south). Stop this here. Keep houses proportional to existing and current houses. Force this designer back to do so.

57 Red Ground Road

The neighbors seem opposed. The addition is out of place, it hangs over the property line, it seems like Queens with crowded homes.

The current homes are quaint and fit together classically. Leave them as they are, or you will destroy the harmony of this piece o the neighborhood. Do not allow past mistakes to justify bad planning now.

Richard Brummel
516-669-1741