

Donna Conkling

From: melissa.pecullan@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2018 6:57 AM
To: Mayor; Matthew Callaghan; lenacrandall.scarsdaletrustee@gmail.com; Carl Finger; seth.h.ross@gmail.com; justinarest.scarsdaletrustee@gmail.com; Jane Veron; Donna Conkling
Subject: Tree code

Dear Mayor Hochvert and the Board of Trustees,

I am writing regarding the proposed tree ordinance. I am unable to attend the public hearing [on April 24](#). I would like this letter to be added to the public record.

I am aware that the proposed tree code has undergone some revisions since I last wrote you. My understanding is that the current draft allows for a homeowner's removal of up to two trees per 24-month period without a permit, provided advance written notification is made to the Village engineer. While this is an improvement over the prior draft (that did not allow the removal of even a single tree without a permit), I still have objections to the current draft.

The proposed changes to the existing tree ordinance are, quite simply, bad policymaking. Changes to the existing tree code have been marketed to the public, both formally and informally, as a means to curtail "clear cutting" and a way to "protect" Scarsdale from developers. Yet, the proposed changes do not do either of those things (above and beyond what the existing code already accomplishes). Instead, the proposed changes inappropriately target individual homeowners who may want to occasionally remove a tree or two. We could all argue over what constitutes "clear cutting." Is it the removal of thirty trees at once? Fifteen trees at once? We may not agree on the exact number, but I think we can certainly agree that the removal of one or two trees in a 12-month period does not constitute "clear cutting." Therefore, what is permissible under the current tree code is not "clear cutting." Further, the sort of large scale land clearing that occurs when a builder demolishes a small, older home to make way for a new, larger home is likely to involve the removal of more than two trees. Therefore, that sort of land development *already requires a permit* for tree removal under the current code. So, in short, making the tree code more restrictive does not increase protections against "clear cutting" and developers. Instead, it merely erodes the rights of individual homeowners.

Please do not pass an unnecessarily restrictive law that fails to address the issue it purports to, has been marketed to the public as something it is not, and cannot claim to have broad support from the community.

Sincerely,
Melissa Pecullan
46 Crossway

Sent from my iPhone