

To: Nick Sugar, City Planner and Amanda Krickovich, Community Development, City of Hudson
From: Olivia Hopkins, AIA | Historic Architecture, Perspectus
Date: April 4, 2024
Re: **43 Church Street**
CC: Lauren Pinney Burge, AIA, Principal & Alice Sloan, Assoc. AIA, APT-RP | Historic Architecture, Perspectus

SUBJECT PROPERTY: 43 Church Street

At the request of the City of Hudson, Ohio and per their Codified Ordinances Section 1202.04(b)(3), Perspectus is providing this advisory report to assist the Architectural and Historic Board of Review (AHBR) in their review of the Owner Application requesting alterations to the designated historic property. The following were applied as it pertains to this application under the Codified Ordinances Appendix D. - Architectural Design Standards Section III-2.b.(1):

1. Codified Ordinances Appendix D. - Architectural Design Standards Section III-2 (attached as **EXHIBIT A**)
2. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (attached as **EXHIBIT B**)
3. National Park Service Preservation Briefs #14 Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns & #16 The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors.

Perspectus performed the following:

1. Reviewed the submitted documentation for the appropriateness of the proposal, compliance with above referenced documents, and general insights on the submittal.
2. Conducted a site visit on March 28, 2024.

QUALIFICATIONS

Lauren Pinney Burge, Principal, Historic Architecture, is a registered Architect in the state of Ohio, meets Federal Qualifications (36 CFR 61) for Architectural History, Architecture, Historic Architecture and Historic Preservation Planning, and is Section 106 Trained.

Olivia Hopkins is a registered Architect in the state of Ohio, meets Federal Qualifications (36 CFR 61) for Architecture, Historic Architecture.

Alice Sloan meets Federal Qualifications (36 CFR 61) for History and Architectural History and is an Association for Preservation Technology Recognized Professional (APT-RP).

PROPOSED CHANGES

The owner proposes to make the following changes to the existing historic structure that dates to c1892 and has a 2018 rear addition:

1. Constructing, at the rear (north) elevation, a two-story addition. Note the proposed addition is behind the existing house and will not be visible when looking at the front (south) elevation from Church Street. The materials of the proposed addition are Red Cedar shingle siding painted to match existing, asphalt shingles, AZEK trim, and an Andersen Folding Outswing Wood/Clad door. The proposed window material is Andersen aluminum clad wood. The proposed building foundation material was noted onsite to be CMU.
 - a. The main massing of the proposed addition is a two-story north/south facing gable constructed to the rear (north) of the 2018 addition. The roof line is above the 2018 one-story roof but is held significantly below the front main mass of the existing house and is held slightly below the rear main mass of the existing house. The side (east) elevation will have two 4 lite fixed windows. The rear (north) elevation at the first floor will have an Andersen Folding Outswing Wood/Clad door with a shed roof overhang above supported by decorative brackets. Note the folding door is not centered with the gable roof. On the rear (north) elevation at the second floor will have a 6 over 6 double hung window that is centered with the gable roof. The side (west) elevation at the second floor will have two 6 lite fixed windows.
 - b. The south half of the side (east) elevation of the proposed addition has a proposed one-story section. This section will align with the side (east) wall of the 2018 addition. The 2018 addition's east/west shed roof will be removed and a new north/south shed roof cover both the proposed one-story addition along with the 2018 addition. The side (east) elevation will have a 6 over 6 double hung window. The rear (north) elevation will have the existing 2018 half lite, 2 paneled fiberglass door reinstalled.
 - c. The entire side (west) elevation of the proposed addition will have a proposed one-story shed roof portion. The side (west) wall of the proposed addition is offset from the side (west) wall of the front main mass of the existing

house. On the side (west) elevation of the one-story portion will have two 6 over 6 double hung windows which are aligned with the proposed new windows above at the two-story portion.

2. Constructing, on the side (west) elevation of the house, a one-story dining room addition with a shed roof. Note the proposed addition is behind the existing house and will not be visible when looking at the front (south) elevation from Church Street. The roof line is held below the existing house and below the 2018 addition's roof. The side (west) wall is offset from the side (west) wall of the front main mass of the existing house. The materials of the proposed addition are Red Cedar shingle siding painted to match existing, asphalt shingles, and AZEK trim. The proposed building foundation material was noted onsite to be CMU. Noted on site the side (west) elevation the proposed 6 over 6 double hung window will potentially be the existing non-historic vinyl window relocated onto the additions west wall. If the window cannot be salvaged the proposed window material was stated to be an Andersen aluminum clad wood.

APPROPRIATENESS OF PROPOSED CHANGES

Proposed changes #'s 1-2: can become appropriate with the following alterations to the design:

Change #1:

- a. Massing: If possible, the massing on the side (east) of the one-story portion should be set back from the 2018 addition's side (east) wall. This will allow for the existing house to be distinguished from the addition, allowing for existing house to not appear to be wrapping around the two-story addition and better comply with Standard #9 (new work shall be differentiated from the old, but compatible with the massing, size, scale). The height of the proposed addition is appropriate, while it is only slightly lower than the rear main mass, the separation created between these two masses with the previous 2018 addition remaining at its current height allows for the two masses to be distinct from each other.
- b. Windows: The proposed windows will comply with Standard #9 if they are 1 over 1 double hung windows or single sash windows without grids/muntins. This allows for the 1 over 1 configuration to be distinct and simplified from the existing first floor 6 over 6 double hung windows. The side (east) transom windows can become appropriate if the grids/muntins are removed to allow to be distinct and simplified. Consider making the rear (north) second floor window a smaller width to be more proportionate to the elevation.
- c. Doors: The proposed rear (north) fiberglass door is appropriate as it is stated on the drawings as, "re-install existing fiberglass door" and is on the rear (north) of the property and cannot be seen from the public realm. The rear (north) folding door's width is appropriate as it is on the rear (north) of the house and cannot be seen from the public realm.
- d. Detailing: The proposed detailing will comply with Standard #9 if the fascia is simplified. This allows for the proposed addition to be simplified in detailing when compared to the original house.

Change #2:

- a. Windows: If the existing window cannot be reused, to comply with Standard #9, the new window should be 1 over 1 double hung. This allows for the 1 over 1 configuration to be distinct and simplified from the existing first floor 6 over 6 double hung windows.
- b. Detailing: The proposed detailing will comply with Standard #9 if the fascia is simplified. This allows for the proposed addition to be simplified in detailing when compared to the original house.

SOURCES CONSULTED

1. AHBR Agenda Packet with OHI Form and proposed drawings by Anthony Slabaugh.
2. AHBR Meeting Agenda Minutes, 43 Church Street, 3/13/2023.
3. Grimmer, Anne and Weeks, Kay. *Preservation Briefs 14 New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns*. National Parks Service US Department of the Interior Technical Preservation Services. August 2021.
4. Sandor, John, Trayte, David and Uebel, Amy. *Preservation Briefs 16 The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors*. National Parks Service US Department of the Interior Technical Preservation Services. September 2023.
5. Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI) form by L Newkirk and F Barlow
6. National Register of Historic Place Form by Thirza M. Cady, Asst. to Janet Sprague. *Hudson Historic District Reference Number 73001542*. April 7, 1973.
7. National Register of Historic Place Form by Lois Newkirk. *Hudson Historic District (Boundary Increase) Reference Number 89001452*. August 19, 1989.
8. National Register of Historic Place Form by Wendy Naylor and Diana Wellman. *Hudson Historic District (Boundary Increase) Reference Number 100007849*. April 15, 2021.

FINDINGS

1. The structure is located in and contributing to the Hudson National Register Historic District, reference numbers 73001542, 89001452, and 100007849. The Period of Significance for the district is 1806-1963. The district is significant under Criteria A and Criteria C.
 - a. The significance under Criteria A as stated in the 1973 National Register Nomination (NRN): "Hudson is a fine example of the early development of the Connecticut Western Reserve both in architecture and town planning." As stated in the 1989 Boundary Increase, "...Boundary Increase is significant under Criteria A, in that the development of the railroad-based economy, with its consequent land development schemes...the community planning and historic restoration movement in the early 20th century are associated with and make a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history." As stated in the 2021 NRN the collection of structures included within the expanded boundary, "demonstrates the pattern of development in Hudson extending from the late nineteenth century post-railroad era decline...continues through the 1950s with the Ellsworth legacy of planning and resulting exurban pattern of growth..."
 - b. The significance under Criteria C as stated in the 1989 NRN; "...Boundary Increase...is significant under Criteria C in that it contains distinctive architectural styles and property types which reflect the history of the area, in its progression in style from Federal to Transitional, Greek Revival, Gothic Revival, Italianate, Queen Anne and twentieth century period revivals." As stated in the 2021 NRN, the collection of structures included within the expanded boundary is "...representative of building styles and types built in the late nineteenth century and dominated by the Colonial Revival style influences..."
 - c. The two western blocks of Church Street, on which the subject property stands at number 43, was part of the original 1973 National Register Historic District. The 1973 NRN states, "In 1799, David Hudson came to survey the land he had purchased from the Connecticut Land Company in the Western Reserve area. Five other men were co-proprietors with him (...Benjamin Oviatt...) and the group wanted to check their acquisition for proposed settlement." The 1989 Boundary Increase, which includes the eastern blocks of Church Street states, "Church Street was also part of the Herman Oviatt Farm given to Western Reserve College in 1983...single family residential, with wood frame houses on small lots with a common setback, close to the street. Foundations are of sandstone, structural tile and concrete block and roofs are asphalt shingle or slate..."
2. The property is located on the north side of the street, the second structure from the corner of Church Street and College Street in the Historic Residential Neighborhood Hudson Zoning District. The terrain is flat.
3. The structure is approximately rectangular in plan, two stories. The structure has wood shake siding. The windows are vinyl double hung windows with integral muntins at the first floor. The foundation is a mix of sandstone and CMU. The structure is vernacular.
4. According to the Ohio Historic Inventory, the front mass of the structure was built c1892. The rear mass of the structure appears to date before 1950 and is therefore considered historic because it was constructed within the period of significance (per Image 1).



Image 1: 1950. Courtesy of the City of Hudson.



Image 2: Front (south) and side (east) elevation.



Image 3: Front (south) elevation.



Image 4: Rear (north) elevation. The one-story mass will remain in place, but the roof will be removed and replaced. The second-floor window will remain.



Image 5: Side (west) elevation.



Image 6: Side (west) elevation. The red square indicates the non-historic vinyl window that is proposed to be reused.



Image 7: Detail of rear (north) door to be reinstalled on the rear (north) elevation in the new side (east) one story mass.



Image 8: Detail of side (west) non-historic vinyl window to be potentially reinstalled in the new one story mass on the side (west) elevation.



Image 9: Hudson National Register Historic District contributing houses to the west.



Image 10: Hudson National Register Historic District contributing house to the east.



Image 11: Hudson National Register Historic District contributing houses to the southwest of 43 Church Street.



Image 12: Hudson National Register Historic District contributing houses to the southeast of 43 Church Street.

END OF REPORT

To Nick Sugar, City Planner and Amanda Krickovich, Community Development, City of Hudson
From Olivia Zepp, AIA | Historic Architecture, Perspectus
CC: Lauren Pinney Burge, AIA, Principal | Historic Architecture, Perspectus and Alice Sloan, Associate AIA

EXHIBIT A: City of Hudson codified ordinance – Design Considerations

Section III-2. - Alterations to existing properties - all types.

The character of Hudson is preserved by maintaining the integrity of buildings as they are altered.

- a. Alterations to non-historic buildings. The following shall apply to all buildings which are not historic properties, as defined in Section III-2(b).
 - (1) In the case of an alteration to an existing property, an applicant must comply with the type design Standards in Part IV to the extent that they apply to the alteration itself.
 - (2) Applicants will be permitted to repair or replace existing non-conforming elements without bringing the element into conformance with the Standards, for example, shutters or windows may be replaced with essentially the same elements.
 - (3) If applicants propose to replace any element with another that is not the same (for example, aluminum windows for wood windows), the applicant will be required to conform fully with the Standards for those elements.
 - (4) Applicants may not be compelled to alter any part of the existing property which would otherwise not be affected by the proposed alteration.
 - (5) For existing buildings which do not conform to the type catalogue in Part IV, alterations will be allowed as long as they conform to the general principles enumerated in Section I-2, and they are compatible with the existing architectural style, materials, and massing of the building.
- b. Standards for historic properties, all districts. Historic properties include those buildings which are contributing to historic districts and buildings which are designated as historic landmarks by the City Council. Other buildings which have historic or architectural significance may also be reviewed as historic properties with the mutual agreement of the AHBR and the applicant.
 - (1) Historic landmarks or buildings within historic districts which are greater than fifty years old will not be reviewed according to the type Standards in Part IV. Such buildings will be reviewed according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation (see Appendix I) and National Park Service Preservation Briefs #14 and #16.
 - (2) In altering historic properties, the applicant is advised to refer to historic surveys and style guides which have been prepared specifically for Hudson, including the Uniform Architectural Criteria by Chambers & Chambers, 1977; Hudson: A Survey of History Buildings in an Ohio Town by Lois Newkirk, 1989; and Square Dealers, by Eldredge and Graham.
 - (3) Hudson's Historic District and Historic Landmarks contain a wealth of properties with well preserved and maintained high quality historic building materials. The preservation of these materials is essential to the distinguishing character of individual properties and of the district. Deteriorated materials shall be repaired where feasible rather than replaced. In the event that replacement is appropriate, the new material should be compatible in composition, design, color, and texture.
- (i). Use of Substitute materials for Historic Properties (as defined in Section III-2. b.).
 - (a.) The AHBR shall review detailed documentation of the existing site conditions.
 - (b.) The AHBR shall request the patching and repair of existing materials.

- (c.) If the repair or replacement of existing non-historic materials is requested, AHBR shall request removal of the non-historic material to expose the historic material so that it may be assessed.
 - (d.) If the AHBR concurs that the condition of the material requires replacement in some or all portions of the structure, like materials should be used. Substitute materials may be considered when the proposed materials do not alter the historic appearance of the structure, and the proposed materials are compatible in proportion, size, style, composition, design, color, and texture with the existing historic materials.
- (ii). Use of Substitute materials for proposed additions to existing historic properties.
- (a.) The placement of the addition shall be reviewed to determine its visibility from the public realm.
 - (b.) Substitute materials are acceptable provided they are compatible in proportion, size, style, composition, design, color, and texture with the existing historic materials.
- (iii). New freestanding structures and non-historic properties: The use of substitute materials is acceptable provided they are compatible in proportion, size, style, composition, design, color, and texture of historic materials.
- (iv). All applications are subject to Section II-1(c).

To Nick Sugar, City Planner and Amanda Krickovich, Community Development, City of Hudson
From Olivia Zepp, AIA | Historic Architecture, Perspectus
CC: Lauren Pinney Burge, AIA, Principal | Historic Architecture, Perspectus and Alice Sloan, Associate AIA

EXHIBIT B: Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

The Standards (Department of Interior regulations, 36 CFR 67) pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy and encompass the exterior and the interior, related landscape features and the building's site and environment as well as attached, adjacent, or related new construction. The Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.