



The City of New York

Queens Community Board 11

Serving the Communities of Auburndale, Bayside, Douglaston, Hollis Hills
Little Neck and Oakland Gardens

Michael Budabin Chair / **Joseph Marziliano** District Manager

TO: All Board Members
FROM: Bernard Haber, P.E., Landmarks Committee Co-Chair
Laura James, Landmarks Committee Co-Chair
DATE: February 23, 2023

RE: 319 38 Road 100 Prospect Avenue
Block 8068, Lot 31 Block 8095, Lot 42

336 38 Road 233-41 38 Drive
Block 8096, Lot 17 Block 8059, Lot 25

On Wednesday, February 22, 2023, the CB11 Landmarks Committee met via Zoom teleconference to review four (4) applications to the NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) for the above-referenced locations.

Present

Bernard Haber, Committee Co-Chair
Laura James, Committee Co-Chair
Victor Dadras, 1st Vice Chair
Henry Euler, 3rd Vice Chair
Christina Scherer, Committee Member
Douglas Montgomery, Committee Member
Jessica Burke, Non-Committee Board Member

CB11 Staff

Joseph Marziliano, District Manager
Jane Bentivenga, Community Coordinator

Guests

Sonya Hong, representing Councilmember Paladino
Qin Liu, Architect, representing 319 38 Road
Sal Prainito, Architect, representing 100 Prospect Avenue
James Grech, owner, 100 Prospect Avenue
Maria Chee, owner, 336 38 Road
John Zefi, owner, 336 38 Road
Frank Petruso, Architect, representing 233-41 38 Drive

Ms. James called the meeting to order. Mr. Liu screen-shared the plans for **319 38 Road**. He reviewed the slides and said they are proposing a horizontal and vertical enlargement. He stated

the lot is 13,457 sq. ft. Mr. Liu stated the proposed lot coverage is 23.53%. There is also a 5% to 7% slope. It will have five bedrooms, four bathrooms, a two-car garage and a cellar. They are also proposing a retaining wall on the slope. An elevator is also proposed.

Mr. Euler asked what the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) has told them. Mr. Liu said the right wing is too high. However, the owners do not want to lower it. Mr. Dadras confirmed their hearing with LPC is Tuesday, February 28, 2023. He commented that the house looks too “boxy”. He also suggested that terracing or landscaping be done to cover the retaining wall. Ms. James asked if the trees in the renderings are existing. Mr. Liu said they will be planting new trees. Mr. Haber inquired about the visibility of the Juliet balconies. Mr. Liu said they will not be visible due to the trees. Mr. Montgomery asked when the house was built. Mr. Liu said 1940. Mr. Liu said it is a non-contributing building. Mr. Montgomery also commented that in addition to the building being brick, he asked if windows will be true divided light. Mr. Liu said they are Andersen E series aluminum-clad wood. All materials will be wood. LPC does not allow plastic or vinyl. Mr. Dadras asked if Mr. Liu has alternate plans in the event LPC does not approve this one. Mr. Liu said yes. Discussion ensued regarding the extension/wing over the garage, the Juliet porches and the retaining wall. A letter will be written to LPC.

Next, the Committee reviewed the plans for **100 Prospect Avenue**. The architect for this application, Mr. Prainito, stated they are amending the original approval from LPC. The owner added a fence in the front on the right side.. In the rear, he took out a wood fence and added a glass fence around the pool. He also added a gazebo. He painted the retaining wall on the Cherry Street side of the property. Instead of covering the other retaining wall (which was holding up the pool) with shrubbery, he covered it with stone. It is six feet high and matches the house.

Mr. Haber questioned the wooden and chain link fence. The owner changed it to all wood. Mr. Haber also inquired if the shrubbery shown by retaining wall that goes all the way to Circle Road is already there. Mr. Prainito said yes. Mr. Haber asked what the purpose of the fence on top of the retaining wall is. Mr. Prainito said there is a 3’6” fence there to prevent anyone from falling because grade on the other side of the fence is almost equal to the retaining wall. Mr. Prainito said they consider it more of a guardrail than a fence. Mr. Haber commented that it is chain link and there is only one other chain link fence in the Manor. Mr. Dadras said chain link is not permitted. Mr. Dadras asked if the things presented are violations the owner is trying to remedy. Mr. Prainito said yes. Mr. Dadras said the fence on top of the retaining wall was an issue when the original application was reviewed several years ago. Mr. Haber said the shrubbery in front of the wall is acceptable. He asked if it can go on top of the wall; he suggested perhaps hedges rather than a chain link fence. Mr. Prainito stated that LPC said providing it is a guardrail, chain link would be acceptable. He also stated that chain link was existing in the front and on the side of the house. Mr. Haber said the Douglas Manor Association does not allow chain link fences as a boundary for a property. Mr. Prainito said LPC does object to the chain link if it is a fence. Mr. Haber raised the issue of the pergola in front of the house at the back of the garage. Mr. Prainito believes it is visible from 240 Street; he stated it was not part of the original application. LPC has not commented on that. This application is scheduled for public hearing at LPC on March 14, 2023. Mr. Haber said a letter will be forwarded to LPC.

The next application discussed was **336 38 Road**. The owners, Maria Chee and John Zefi screen-shared their presentation. The existing house is approximately 2,900 sq. ft. The proposal

is to add 2,187 sq. ft. which will include a sunroom and a garage. The house overlooks Udall's Cove.

Ms. Chee said they are proposing an addition to the east side of the house. They will be working with the natural slope of the property; very little excavation needs to be done. They are proposing to demolish the existing garage and rebuild it; there will be an L-shaped retaining wall around the garage. Mr. Haber asked how high it will be. Ms. Chee said it will be 5'3" high. Mr. Montgomery asked if this was previously two lots. Ms. Chee said yes, they combined it into one tax lot. The house is currently 26' x 26'. The proposed addition will be 17' wide x 27' long. The new windows will be aluminum clad with wood. They are proposing to enclose the porch. LPC asked that the stucco wall not be visible. They will address that. All the finishes they are using follow LPC guidelines.

Mr. Haber asked about using the driveway when there is icy weather. He suggested that a heating element could be added. Mr. Zefi said they have a service who will clear all issues with snow and/or ice. Mr. Haber asked if any retaining walls are needed. Ms. Chee said no. Mr. Haber asked how far it was from back of the house to the property line. Mr. Zefi said it is the length of the garage plus an additional two to three feet. Approximately 15' to 17'. The siding will be clapboard that they are going to paint. The proposed garage will be less visible than the existing one. Lot size is 12,197 sq. ft., existing floor area is 1,704 and the proposed floor area is 2,235. Proposed lot coverage is 18%. Mr. Haber asked if they have sump pumps in the basement. Mr. Zefi said they do not; they don't have any water issues. Mr. Dadras stated he feels this is a very good presentation. He did ask if they considered using the garage as the retaining wall. They did but feel if something needs repair it will be easier to fix the wall. Mr. Zefi added they also want to prevent any degradation of the slope. Ms. Scherer asked about the proximity of a utility pole to their driveway. The pole is far enough away. It won't be an issue. One last thing Ms. Chee said was LPC wanted a change to the shape of the rear attic dormer to a shed dormer. Mr. Haber said a letter will be forwarded to LPC.

The last item reviewed was for a garage at **233-41 38 Drive**. The architect, Frank Petruso, explained that the former structure, which was a stable/carriage house, had to be demolished after a tree fell on it. They need to construct a new garage. It will be a detached garage. It will not be as high as the former building but will be of similar size and footprint. It will be a two-car garage standing 10' high. It will have an open porch on the side. It will be cedar, stained gray to match the house. The trim will be white. The doors will be gray to match the cedar. It will be 5' from the lot line. Mr. Dadras asked if this is a rebuild of the carriage house. Mr. Petruso said yes but it will not be as massive. Mr. Haber said a letter will be forwarded to LPC.

At this point, Committee members discussed the applications presented. The first application discussed was for 319 38 Road. It was agreed that the following concerns would be sent to LPC:

- that the current design presents a very wide, uninterrupted frontage and the extension on the right side of the building is out of proportion and should be reduced in size
- the front retaining wall is too large and a similar result can be obtained through terracing and landscaping
- the front entrance balcony is overly ornate and not in keeping with the design of the building
- what is the purpose of the balconies both on the south and north sides

Until these comments are addressed, CB11 cannot recommend approval of this application.

The next application discussed was 100 Prospect Avenue. There are several violations on this property that need to be addressed. The chain link fence on top of the concrete wall is not acceptable. Instead of the chain link fence, hedges and shrubbery should be used on top of the concrete wall. On Prospect Avenue, the short wood fence on top of the concrete wall should be replaced with shrubbery. Until these and other violations are corrected, CB11 cannot recommend approval of this application.

The application for 336 38 Road was discussed next. There were no critical comments regarding this application. Due to the steepness of the driveway towards the garage, it was suggested that a heating element could be added to this area to be used during severe, winter weather. The Committee unanimously approved this application.

The application for 233-41 38 Drive was discussed last. The Committee had no comments and recommended approval of this replacement garage.

Respectfully submitted February 24, 2023