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Application for removal of 15 trees in connection with permits filed for excavation and fill and wetland disturbance

MARY ANNE COPPINS OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Tonight we are going to start with Mr. Paul, 3 Picardy Lane.

MR. AVRUTINE: This is P7-2018/T42-2018, the Public Hearing on the application of Jason Paul, 3 Picardy Lane, an approval to remove 15 trees in connection with permits filed for excavation and fill and wetland disturbance.

The parcel of property under application is known as Section 14 , Block 14, Lot 23, on the Land and Tax Map of Nassau County.

The exhibits in connection with this hearing are as follows:

First, is an affidavit of posting from Elizabeth Kaye that the legal notice was posted on the bulletin board in front of Village Hall on July 12 , 2019.

The next exhibit is an affidavit of publication that the legal notice was published in the North Shore Leader on July 17, 2019.

The next exhibit is a document that confirms that the legal notice was published to the Village website on July 16, 2019.

The next exhibit is a document that confirms that the legal notice was sent to Village website NEWS subscribers on July 25, 2019 .

The next exhibit is an affidavit of mailing from the applicant indicating that the notice of public hearing was mailed as required on July 16, 2019.

The last exhibit is the notification from the Nassau County Planning Commission that is dated October 22, 2018 that the matter is referred to the Village of Laurel Hollow Planning Board to take action as it deems appropriate.

Is there a representative on behalf of the applicant here this evening?

MR. PAUL: Yes.
MR. AVRUTINE: Please state your name for the record.

MR. PAUL: Jason Paul, 3 Picardy

Lane, Laurel Hollow, New York 11791.
CHAIR HADJANDREAS: The floor is yours, sir.

MR. PAUL: Okay. I don't know what the format is. I assume you guys have gone through all the documents.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Why don't you talk about the planned project, what you want to accomplish, why you want to do it, why it's necessary to remove the trees.

We don't make a decision on the fill permit. If we approve what is going on, or however we approve, you still have to go in front of the Board of Trustees for a fill permit.

MR. AVRUTINE: And a wetlands disturbance, as well.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: And wetlands disturbance.

Tonight, we are basically
discussing your plan for what you want to do in regards to the removal of trees and landscaping.

MR. AVRUTINE: Just to clarify, for
the Board's edification, as well as the applicant, any approval issued in connection with the removal of the trees, presumably, will be contingent upon approval by the Board of Trustees of the fill and the wetlands disturbance application, as well.

MEMBER GALTIERI: What about the landscaping, the landscaping, I thought we also had.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: If we approve it, he still can't do it until the Board of Trustees approves the fill permit, the wetland disturbance. If they don't approve it, then everything we do is null and void.

MR. AVRUTINE: Presumably. This Board is authorizing, assuming it does, removal of trees in connection with the project that is also going to be before the Board of Trustees. Assuming, for argument sake, the Board of Trustees denies those applications, I presume, and you will determine, whether you want to allow them to remove the trees even
if those applications are denied.

MEMBER GALTIERI: Right, but there is a landscape proposal here, as well, right?

MR. AVRUTINE: There is a
landscaping plan submitted along with this, yes.

MEMBER GALTIERI: We would want, before we get the final approval, that has to be certified that it's been done, right?

MR. AVRUTINE: Well, not --

MEMBER GALTIERI: The landscaping.

MR. AVRUTINE: At the end, yes, there is a certification requirement.

MEMBER GALTIERI: I just want to make that clear.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Absolutely, because the applicant is going for a building permit, they basically, in a sense a building permit, but he's not building anything, he's doing some drainage, it's still a permit and he won't be able to close that permit unless the certification, whatever we approve is done.

MEMBER GALTIERI: I just want to make it clear.

MR. PAUL: Just for clarification, when you're talking about the landscaping plan, we're talking about the trees, not the grass, not the gardens.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Right. You are saying here that you want to cut down 15 trees, but we are going to discuss what you want to put in and what trees you want to plant. That is what we are talking about your landscaping plan. We are talking about screening and trees and not perennials or annuals or anything like that or grass.

But after everything is said and done, you do the work, we normally would say the landscaper of record would have to certify with their, but you don't -this is something that you have done, so you don't have a landscaper of record. So that is something that we are going to need, some kind of certification that
everything you commit to planting is in the ground, healthy and where it's supposed to be.

MR. PAUL: Sure.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: But that is one thing we are going to have to figure out.

MR. AVRUTINE: A professional is going to have to --

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: A professional is going to have to certify that. It could be the Village arborist. We would have to see if she may -- it may be something between you and her in terms of her then certifying your project outside of her.

MR. AVRUTINE: We haven't done that before.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Everyone else has to like whatever, a nursery or a professional to do it.

MR. AVRUTINE: In many instances a landscape architect.

MR. PAUL: Sure. I mean to the extent with that, that does not seem to
be a problem. I would just add that many of the items on there are really more by choice, rather than the necessity to facilitate some of the things I'm going to do.

If I'm taking out five trees and replacing them with five, I don't have to do 15, some of those items are still to be determined, but at a minimum, it will be something along those lines and at least those types of trees that I have indicated, which is based upon the arborist's feedback.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Does someone have the arborist report for Mr. Paul? I didn't bring mine.

Before you start, I just wanted to, as part of the record, put in the arborist report.

As per your request, I inspected the above site as per your request.

MR. AVRUTINE: The reason you're reading it into the record, it is part of the record already.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: For the
record: A marked up survey shows 15
trees to be removed. They're primarily red maple with a couple of sassafras. Trees are in various stages.

I just want to see if there is something in the arborist report where she says specifically her concerns.

MR. AVRUTINE: What she basically stated, I'll sum it up, but it is part of the record.

The Village arborist recommends that the application be approved, but she also stated that she recommended that three trees be replaced and she was suggesting native species such as red maple, oak or sassafras flowering dogwood or red bud as lower level flowering trees. These trees should be planted inside the property line, so as not to interfere with the power lines.

She also indicated that there were trees that were slated to be removed which should remain. And she stated there is a 14 inch and 15-inch red maple outside of the proposed fill area, along
with a northerly property line. So she indicated those should be slated to remain.

I think the application materials also contain a response to those comments, but $I$ don't know whether those issues, if those issues have been resolved in any way.

Maybe the applicant could shed some light on that.

MR. PAUL: Yes. I mean, I don't know if this is the one, $I$ don't know what exhibit you guys have this as.

MR. AVRUTINE: That was submitted separately from what you are looking at.

MR. PAUL: As a result of the larger project, which is on the northeast portion of my property, the only low area we have that is flat, the idea is we put in a garden. This is where my kids will play. Granted, it's 2 acres, but there is a lot of slope and unusable land so this is really the only place we can deem usable.

It was previously not kept up at
all, a lot of poison ivy. We removed all the poison ivy and cleared out all the dead trees that were laying on the ground, nothing that was standing.

The idea is that we are going to increase the privacy screening because the current trees that exist are either in deteriorated health and are going to fall down, have fallen down, have been in the power lines, down on the street during the snowstorms, there are others that just snapped off, so underneath the Village requirements for size for needing a permit to be able to remove. For the most part, it's not been up-kept in a long time so $I$ am trying to improve upon it the same way $I$ did the rest of the property.

MEMBER GALTIERI: Your house looks beautiful, by the way.

MR. PAUL: Thank you.
The area down there is very much roots, wild growth, more poison ivy that's come back because $I$ was trying to do it a year and-a-half ago. So, the
area in there, there has been water observed. I deem it's never been more than 4 inches. I have the evidence to support that.

In that low area, there is an accumulation of water through the process of submitting for permits to add fill to stabilize the hill that is along the slope that is on eastern side of -western side of Picardy, eastern side of the property, so $I$ can finish my fence project, which $I$ got permits for a year and-a-half ago.

I am also trying to keep the trees that $I$ have put in from dying because they are too exposed the way the slope is and the water runoff mostly because of the sand that is there. So adding the fill will allow me to finish that off. The idea is you can't tell the difference from the street. It's all just to back fill on the exposed side on the privacy screening that $I$ already have. When you guys were there, you could see that some of those trees have
died, in large part due to that.
Down in the basin $I$ need to install some drainage to be able to aggregate the water so there is no pooling. That is also part of the wetlands and fill permits.

The trees that are in this area
that are in the fill area are either, one, in the way of where the fence will go. They're not necessarily in the ground where the fence is but they're leaning into it and potentially can fall onto it. Again, most of them are in bad health, not going to enhance the beauty of the area. There are a couple of other trees that are also based upon the landscaping plan that would make it very difficult for the new trees to survive because they are blocking most of the sunlight.

In fact, trees one, two and three, although, $I$ think tree one is dead, trees two and three will block a majority of the sunlight going into the area where we're going to be planting a
vegetable garden, it's where the sun is on our property throughout the day.

The other remaining trees that are in what is labeled the flat area on the landscaping plan are simply either very small, or, quite frankly, just in the way. I envision this as a place where I can have a catch with my son, where more kids can play soccer or lacrosse, you name it. I don't want them to hit a tree or run into a tree in the middle of playing. I never had a tree in the middle of my backyard when $I$ was growing up.

The trees that we do want to have, and I am not looking to just blatantly remove all the trees, $I$ want to remove the trees that are in the way, that $I$ don't think do anything to aid, again, the property at all. There are other trees that $I$ would like to stay which I believe are healthy, and which I believe look nice, and will look nice once we are able to add other trees, lower trees, which will allow us to have
privacy.

In fact, some of the trees on here of 9, 14, 15, which are in the flat area in the most northeastern most section do nothing to aid any privacy at all. And I believe those would be the biggest deterrent to the new trees actually surviving. I think that is the general nature of what $I$ am trying to do.

MEMBER JONES: Can I ask a question?

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Of course.

MEMBER JONES: I just wanted to --

I am confused, I just want a clarification.

On the document it says the trees that are marked 14 and 15 are inside the project area because one of the trees we are looking at is number 14.

But here you are saying that I believe 14 is under the circumference required for a permit on the cover here, in your paragraph.

MR. PAUL: Tree number 14?

MEMBER JONES: Yes.

MR. PAUL: Number 9 is --

MEMBER JONES: It says trees marked number 14 and 15 are inside the project area. As previously noted, not all the trees require permits for removal even though you put them on the application.

I believe number 14 is under the circumference required for a permit.

MR. PAUL: Which one are we talking about, I apologize. There have been like five different submissions because of the other permits, so the numbers of the trees may be different.

MEMBER JONES: This is Tuesday, November 13th.

But then when you go to -- you have a picture here because $I$ thought that number 14 that we were referring to is bigger.

MR. PAUL: Number 14 is bigger, so that...

MEMBER JONES: Okay.

MR. PAUL: Number 14 would not fall into the category of not requiring a permit because of the size, number 9
definitely would.
MEMBER JONES: So number 9 is also 18 inches, right?

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: According to this.

MEMBER JONES: So, number 14 , this is number 14, then...

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: A 30-inch
tree. It's easily, if not the biggest, probably the biggest single tree on the property.

MR. PAUL: To give you a little bit more insight into what $I$ was thinking, there are two trees that would be -that are larger trees that would be in the play area, one is more towards the interior of the property. This is a nicer tree. This one gets more privacy. It's not on there for removal because I wasn't looking to remove it.

So the deciding factor we had was to keep that tree or keep this tree because then it would shift the area, the play area. And because this one doesn't do anything for privacy and is
also going to hurt the other trees that we plant, we decided we would try to remove this one and leave that one.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Mr. Paul, the question $I$ have for you is with what you are saying, removing tree 14, what, specifically, what is going to enable you to plant along what we will call along Picardy, and then the northern property line.

MR. PAUL: In that area $I$ have on here, we're planting a flowering dogwood, some lower hollies, red maple, mountain laurel, things of that type, and we are going to have to see exactly.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Do you have a specific breakdown, because $I$ see all of these dots and blue circles and dark dots.

Do you know what you would -- what you can commit to in terms of how many deciduous trees, how many screening trees you are going to be planting along the north side and along Picardy.

MR. PAUL: Along the north side,
there would be -- assuming I can remove all of these trees because if I can't, I don't think they're going to survive and I don't think that makes sense, it defeats the project. Five trees along the north side.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: And what is the breakdown on that? Is it cypress or similar? Is that Leland or something along those lines?

MR. PAUL: Along those lines. And the idea there is $I$ need something taller because of the slope coming down.

Frankly, this is my largest concern of everything, that you can see into my entire backyard and $I$ don't want that to be the case. So those trees will grow taller and enable privacy from the site line that is higher up on the hill. The other trees that are lower, like the flowering dogwood, are relative to the trees that are already there.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: So one
flowering dogwood, the five cypress, honestly, $I$ don't think cypress is going
to do anything there. I think you are going to have to have something like a holly or something that can handle the shade, but that is between you and your -- this is, again, whatever we approve tonight is like okay, you are saying you're going to put five hollies or cypress, something that is evergreen.

MR. AVRUTINE: In that case, you may want to consider requesting a revised landscaping plan specifying what the Board is requiring so it's clear on the record and then in the file.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Then contingent to that.

MEMBER GALTIERI: What I was saying is normally when we see a plan to remove trees there is a plan to plant, but a formal plan so that we can see more or less exactly what is going in. It's hard to approve the trees going out without seeing definitely what is going back in, in my opinion.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: And this could be that.

I understand what you are saying, like this is your idea. But what we want to say is okay, if this is the plan, that is the plan, and you drew it, it's here. If we work off of this plan, and we can make amendments to that plan and then you would revise it to the amendments we make, then your permit and everything would be subject to that.

But I just wanted for the Board, it's five trees along the north side, that flowering dogwood. Then it's showing a holly, a red maple, then a mountain laurel and there are two others.

Now, moving towards the left of -towards your driveway along Picardy, and you have some Leyland cypress, two of them, a weeping willow, red bud, another dogwood, and then the rest are shrubs or whatever else.

MR. PAUL: I think to this point I put in far more trees than I've removed since day one of being on the property. There is up to 30 spruce and pines along
the street. So the trees that are going to be on the interior, I'm fine with what is on here as the proposal. Again, I just state that $I$ wasn't asked to replace every single tree $I$ removed. I think that kind of defeats a little bit of the purpose of clearing some of the area, but I'm happy to plant things that the Board is looking for and that gets me privacy and allows me to have this area as a play area and garden and nothing obstructing it.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Would the weeping willow -- it's hard to tell from here, but there is a big drop off and $I$ know you want to add fill behind where the berm is that is along Picardy.

Is the weeping willow, are you considering that at the top of the hill or the bottom in the low lying section. MR. PAUL: On the drawing you can see that there is the grid, so one square of the grid is where the low area ends. So, effectively, that's the low. So all the new trees, none of them are
going to be on slope, they'll all be at the basin, at the bottom. The weeping willow, that'll be closest to the drainage and where the water accumulates.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: That's what you want.

Okay, Mrs. DiBlasio, do you have any questions?

MEMBER DiBLASIO: Not at the moment.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: I think, again, a concern with the Board is tree number 14. It's the only tree out of all the trees that you are -- besides tree numbers two and three that I'm kind of separating that out right now but focusing on the new grass flat area, tree 14 was the only tree that was there that was healthy and is in good shape.

And from what I understand, what you are saying is that removal of that tree would push the flat area back further. How many other trees -- and they are not on the plan here -- but
what would that impact?
MR. PAUL: If that one was kept, then there is only one tree we would have to remove and that's the blue dot above the word flat area.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: What is that tree?

I see a picture of it, I see the dot, but we don't have any records of it.

MR. PAUL: The height?
CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Yes.
MR. PAUL: It's a big tree. It's similar size, it's just -- I'm not an arborist, it has more leaves along the tree going up so it serves as privacy. It's a nicer tree than the tree we are proposing. The tree that we are proposing doesn't give us any privacy. It's stuck up in the canopy.

In one of the pictures that I took you can see actually it doesn't increase the side of the canopy because it's underneath the bigger trees that are going to remain.

MEMBER JONES: I'm confused. The tree that $I$ think we were looking at, I thought it had the big caliper and it wasn't under the trees, it was kind of over the trees.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: The canopy.
I mean it's a big tree, tree number 14 is the tallest tree there.

MR. AVRUTINE: If I may, I just want to say, so the record is clear, the reference is the tree numbers and the plan the applicant submitted it states at the top of it 3 Picardy, LM Lane Landscaping, and it says add -- does not have a date, no. But it is multicolored and specifies numbered trees, as well as numbered trees to be removed as well as trees to be planted.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Would you propose planting additional deciduous trees to get acceptance to remove that tree? Is there something else --

MR. PAUL: To what I already proposed?

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Yes.

MR. PAUL: What do you have in mind?

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Would the Board consider that or is that something --

MEMBER GALTIERI: Yes. I think, look, maybe $I$ am missing something here, but $I$ don't think this is ready, in my opinion. I would like to see really what is going in and that will determine what we need to approve and not to approve. It's hard to do this in the abstract, for me, anyway.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Well, he does show what he wants to put in. What I am asking is if he adds -- because there is only like the dogwoods and the cypress are not -- are more screening. They are not anything that is going to add to the canopy, which is a concern. The only trees that -- and are Leylands are not -- the red maple and the red bud.

I am only seeing two deciduous trees that are really -- you are taking -- you are asking to take down 15 trees
and really, in the big scheme of things in terms of replacing, you're putting in two -- I mean, the weeping willow would fall in that category as well, so three trees that are in the same classification as the trees that are removed. So that's why $I$ am throwing this back to you so that if you say, okay, in this area.

MR. PAUL: I mean, I am trying to, I guess in my mind $I$ was not really asking to remove many healthy trees; really two to three, not 15. I still stand by the fact $I$ don't need a permit to remove all 15 trees based upon what the Village Code says; however, I don't think $I$ need to add all of these trees based upon what the arborist has suggested either. I'm willing to, to appease, effectively. But $I$ don't want there to be an overwhelming number of trees.

MR. AVRUTINE: I just wanted to make it clear that the arborist's report is an assessment based on her
professional training, et cetera, but it's a recommendation only. The Board makes the decision as to whether the proposed mitigation of the impacts from the removal are sufficient by what new plantings you are going to make.

I know you have mentioned that you are planting more than you are taking out, but I think what the Chairman is indicating is that there may be more in number, but they may not be equivalent in quality or the ability to screen or any of these qualities.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Let me explain why I am saying this.

Everything that you want to do here is the setback. Normally, in previous hearings, last week's hearing, everything that the homeowner wanted to do is behind their house within their -outside of their setback. So, again, they were removing $X$ amount of trees to put in a pool and patio and whatnot, but nothing was visible from the road. Everything you want to do is visible
from Picardy and from possibly
Stillwell, and that is why this is a sensitive area and that is the concern that the Board has. So that's why. And what the Board wants to maintain is canopy and maintaining canopy of trees. That's why tree 14 really fell on a lot of the Board members's concerns because, again, it's the tree that offers the biggest canopy. It is the biggest tree and the nicest tree that is there. MR. PAUL: Of the list. CHAIR HADJANDREAS: A lot of what you propose removing, within a year or two will remove themselves by falling down. We know that. But again, the healthy trees that are there, and there are a couple of them that we are trying to see if we can work something around or say, okay, if this is what you are proposing you're kind of limited on your property, there is really -- other than this, there is really no other --

MR. PAUL: I'd like to do things in the setback but this is how the property
works. Unfortunately, that's what I have to deal with.

Again, $I$ think you guys have seen what the house was before and what the property was before what it is now. I think all of this would be done in the same vein and it'll do nothing but to make it look nicer. There is still well over 500 trees on the property, most of which are never going to be touched and I can't use that land. So I think that this is a small portion in relative terms compared to the amount of trees actually on the property.

MEMBER DiBLASIO: Would you be adverse about replacing the cypress maybe with red maple?

MR. PAUL: The Leyland cypress with the red maple? Sure, that's fine.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: And one of the things in the arborist report was there is a list of trees that the Village wants to encourage to plant. I think the list is 10 , maybe 15 trees long, and the red maple is on there. There are
other trees, species. Again, those are the trees that are going to enhance the canopy.

The other concern that the arborist had with your specific application was you can plant trees like red maples or oaks, or whatever, if you plant them underneath the power lines, in five years they're just going to get decapitated like all these other trees on your property. Again, we want them planted in an area the canopy can expand and grow and do whatever.

MR. PAUL: Sure.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Without
interfering with the power lines and

PSEG coming in every other year and cutting them.

MR. PAUL: I agree with that. The ones that are through the power lines, I have complained to them that $I$ think they should come down, that they're problematic.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: We have seen this.

MR. PAUL: All of the new trees are going to be on the interior of the power line. They won't be anywhere near them. They're actually probably 20 feet from them. Even if they grow up, there is not going to be any issues to deal with. There's definitely no issues with Picardy like some of the trees have been down during the storms. But, again, the reason why they're on the perimeter is: One, privacy; and, two, if I planted them in the middle where $I$ am removing trees then $I$ don't have a yard.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: To address Mr. Galtieri's concern in terms of your plan, and if we work off of this plan, we are seeing on the north side of the property five -- it's a cypress or similar, can we narrow that down. That is a concern for you because as cars come west on Picardy, again, you are completely exposed over there.

Is five hollies or whatever that you're going to do in that area in terms of evergreens, is that sufficient to
screen that side?
MR. PAUL: Assuming they will survive.

So one issue I have, right, is this is my property. To the north of me, there are a lot of trees because the house is much further up the hill. They are not maintained, so those are definitely blocking sunlight and they do nothing for privacy because of how full they are. So to the extent that planting trees there and it gets enough sun, $I$ am fine with adding two more.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: That's why I am saying the specific types of trees you are going to have to put there that can handle that area, that's where a landscape designer, but $I$ don't know; again, that is something.

So, in this area in terms of screening between that and your neighbor to the north, because again, everything you are doing is in this setback, so we have that concern.

One thing I didn't ask if there's
anyone in the audience that -- are any of your neighbors here?

No, okay.
That is a concern that the Village has that we're allowing you to remove all this now and your neighbor is exposed more, so that's why we want to enhance that buffer zone.

So if we go side to side, on the north side of the property, you are proposing there are three dots, but you were proposing five.

MR. PAUL: The two are in the corner, other than relatively the tree remaining. The idea is to kind of shape it out catty corner with -- inside the fence line. So in this general vicinity, it could be a couple of feet over.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: And you are proposing five cypress or holly or something that would, in your professional opinion, would work in that area?

MR. PAUL: Right.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: In the front, where Mrs. Di Blasio had suggested Leylands, they offer screening, they need full sun, you're not going to have full sun there. You're proposing two Leylands.

And, again, the Board is -- this isn't me saying, the Board would have to agree. Would the Board like to see something additional there, in terms of deciduous, if we move forward with this application as to the rest of it?

MEMBER GALTIERI: You're taking down 14?

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Yes.

MEMBER GALTIERI: What would be the proper tree to go there, though.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: I think something from the list that the arborist has already approved, and I don't have them off the top of my head, but there's about 10 different types, oaks, maples, different types of maples.

MR. PAUL: I can move the red bud. Again, I've got excess number of trees
that $I$ need for the area because of all the trees along the street that are now going to survive. I can move the red bud in place of where the Leyland cypress is. There are two existing trees that $I$ am not taking down that are right in that area. That's why I didn't overwhelm that area with trees because they are not going to get sun. There still are a lot of trees. I can move that one over.

I don't want to -- part of the problem with the property is that nobody thinned the trees over the years, so the big ones are clogged in with the smalls ones and you don't get to see the nice healthy ones. I would like to be able to see the nice healthy ones.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: And replace the Leylands with something from the tree list, we'll call it the tree list, it's the arborist.

MR. PAUL: Sure.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Would the Board -- Mrs. Jones, do you have a
question?
MEMBER JONES: With a permit, he is requesting, Mr. Paul has requested 15 trees but he keeps saying that there are not that many that require permits.

Can you -- I can't remember what size is in the code.

MR. AVRUTINE: 8 inch.
CHAIR HADJANDREAS: 7 inches.
MR. AVRUTINE: 7 inch.
CHAIR HADJANDREAS: It's specific, there is specific -- there are others --

MEMBER JONES: All of these trees require a permit.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Right;
however, if a tree is coming out of the ground or is significantly a danger, then a lot of times $I$ am asked, and yes, remove it. You still have to file a permit but it's granted automatically because it's a danger, but it still counts towards your tree count and it's still -- so the wording that Mr. Paul was using is not accurate -- he still is required to and he is applying to remove

15 trees.
MR. AVRUTINE: Correct. The application calls for 15, so you're considering removing the 15.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: There are no other trees that he wants to remove that are not on here, that he's decided he didn't need a permit for, if that answers your question.

MEMBER JONES: Okay.
CHAIR HADJANDREAS: So, do you guys -- let's sit on this for a second and then move to tree numbers 1, 2 and 3 because that's the only other trees the Board member had concerns with.

Tree number 1, I viewed and saw that it is precarious, I'd say, so, I've spoken to the Board and nobody has any issue with the removal of that tree.

Tree numbers 2 and 3, as per one of your submissions to the Board, I'm not sure you received this over e-mail, I know Liz did. I don't know if this got into the record or --

MR. AVRUTINE: If it's in the file,
it is in the record.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Showing the site line, and the concern with tree number 2 and 3, removing those trees, what that does in terms of opening up that whole side of the -- this whole area in terms of exposing it. Those, tree number 2 and 3, specifically, offer a lot of screening. So...

MR. PAUL: I would argue -- and you can see from the pictures -- that the angle, the only location you can see them from the street is standing in the driveway. The angle at which you can see them, there is another tree behind it that is bigger and more flowering, that when you remove it that tree will still be there. You still will not be able to see into the backyard. That's one thing with the trees.

Secondly, I am going to continue to plant shrubs, bushes, as I've got on here, once the fence is in, and that's the fence that runs right along where those trees are.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: That was a question $I$ had. The fence permit has already been issued. These trees, tree 1, forget about that for now it's not an issue, but tree 2 and 3 , is it in the path of the fence? Is it -- can the fence be adjusted to the right, to the left?

MR. PAUL: It is not in the direct path of the fence but the two issues with it: One, it's at the same angle as the dead tree, which is actually over the power lines through the remaining trees that are just growing bigger. And the larger issue is it blocks all of the sunlight to the garden. So I don't think the garden survives at all with those trees there. That's the only place $I$ have that $I$ can put a garden, none of which will be visible from the street.

So this area -- one other thing to consider as well, the only way you can see this currently is from an angle through the driveway. All the
landscaping I have around the driveway is going to get bigger. My ultimate goal is, unless you're standing in my driveway you cannot see into my yard, similar to many of the other homes throughout the Village.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Do any of the Board members have any concerns or questions?

MEMBER GALTIERI: No. I can let 2 and 3 go. But will we see a formal write up of what gets planted in any period of time.

MR. AVRUTINE: If that's what you want.

MEMBER GALTIERI: That's what I want.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: I think
amending this, and making -- amending this and then having -- just saying, okay, we're working with his plan, but then...

MR. AVRUTINE: Let me propose two options to you: You can continue the hearing, subject to submission of a plan
that is satisfactory before you vote; or, you can vote on the application tonight conditioned upon submission of a plan with sufficient detail and explanation that is satisfactory to the Board. Those would be the two options I could recommend.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: And $I$ would agree with that, because $I$ think in terms of changing some of the things he's suggesting he has a plan here. We can amend the plan, then he can fix it and resubmit it to us and as long as it's what we agree to, then move forward.

MEMBER GALTIERI: I'm good with that.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: So, in terms of adding to work off the plan that you have submitted, again, the concern was adding more deciduous trees that are going to kind of replace the ones that we are concerned with. So we have everything you are proposing here, which is fine. If we replace the Leylands
with something from the tree list, let me just cross that out and write tree list. And there are two Leylands that are shown on here.

MR. PAUL: Yes. I would think we would just go with the one we are replacing because it's going to be a bigger wider tree.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Well, Leylands are actually wider initially in terms of their 6-foot round circumference. When you put them in the ground then they go from there. A deciduous tree you're going to put in is going to be a 4-inch caliper. So I would like to see the number that you -- even increasing possibly to instead of two Leylands, we stick -- is there a number that any of Board members -- these trees are coming off the list that Betsy suggests. MEMBER GALTIERI: I think Howard said let us look at a proposal. Let's approve this upon the contingency of us approving the proposal that comes back. Let's give him some latitude to take a
look at what he wants to do.
MEMBER DiBLASIO: Are there any size constraints that we need to deal with on the size of the trees that he puts in?

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: I mean, we have never -- the only time we have done that is when it's a specific -- when it's evergreens and we said, okay, we don't want evergreens this tall, we want at least 6 to 8 foot. But we can make on the side, that's a good point, the hollies or whatever you are going to put along the side. We can state that in the plan, it should state that you have a minimum of 6 to 8-feet tall.

Those are the only trees, the dogwood, the red buds, the weeping willows, you're buying them and you are getting them at 4-inch caliper, whatever, and they're going to be at about 10 to 12-feet tall from the get go.

MR. AVRUTINE: Mr. Paul, did you prepare this yourself or did the person
who you are going to be buying the plants from?

MR. PAUL: Except for the survey, I did everything myself.

MR. AVRUTINE: For whatever it's worth, you may wish to consider having, even if it is not a landscape architect, but maybe if you know who you are going to be purchasing the trees from, they may be able to do something for you that is a little bit more detailed and contains the information that the Board is looking for. For instance, the calipers, the circumferences and the height when planted, et cetera, so that it will be a sufficiently detailed plan so that you won't have to resubmit more than once.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: And that person is then the designer of record and that person can certify, after everything is said and done, that what you have committed to planting is actually in the ground and healthy because we're not going to take -- we
can't take your certification as the homeowner. We need someone with a stamp or someone with a license.

MR. PAUL: I guess I'm not planting these myself.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: You can plant them, you just need a design person that can certify that they are what they are and that they are in the ground and they are alive.

MR. AVRUTINE: And that they match the approved plan.

MR. PAUL: I will provide detail.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: So, I guess we
can move forward based on that amended -- on the amended plan that we discussed.

MEMBER GALTIERI: Right.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Okay.

MR. AVRUTINE: Any questions from
the Board?
(No response.)

Any questions from the audience?
(No response.)

MR. AVRUTINE: Motion to close the
public hearing.
CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Motion.
MR. AVRUTINE: Second.
MEMBER GALTIERI: Second.
MR. AVRUTINE: Motion by the Chair, second by Member Galtieri.

All in favor.

MEMBER JONES: Aye.
MEMBER GALTIERI: Aye.
MEMBER DiBLASIO: Aye.
CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Aye.
MR. AVRUTINE: Let the record
reflect that this matter is deemed Type
II under the New York State
Environmental Quality Review Act.
Is there a motion on the application?

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Motion to approve.

MR. AVRUTINE: Motion by the Chair. That would be subject to the submission of a revised landscape plan to the satisfaction of the Board.

CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Right.
MR. AVRUTINE: With sufficient

```
detail and satisfaction to the Board.
```

    CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Right.
        MR. AVRUTINE: Second on that?
        MEMBER DiBLASIO: Second.
        MR. AVRUTINE: Member DiBlasio.
        All in favor?
        MEMBER JONES: Aye.
        MEMBER GALTIERI: Aye.
        MEMBER DiBLASIO: Aye.
        CHAIR HADJANDREAS: Aye.
        MR. AVRUTINE: Application granted
    with the proposed stipulations.
MR. PAUL: Thank you.
* * * * * *
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