



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Draft Architectural & Historic Board of Review

John Caputo, Chair
Allyn Marzulla, Vice Chair
John Workley, Secretary
Amy Manko
Françoise Massardier-Kenney
William Ray
Jamie Sredinski

Nicholas Sugar, City Planner
Amanda Krickovich, Associate Planner

Wednesday, February 26, 2025

7:30 PM

Town Hall
27 East Main Street

I. Call To Order

Chair Caputo called to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Architectural & Historic Board of Review of the City of Hudson at 7:30 p.m., in accordance with the Sunshine Laws of the State of Ohio, O.R.C. Section 121.22.

II. Roll Call

Present: 7 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

III. Public Comment

Chair Caputo opened the meeting to public comments for anyone wanting to address the Board. There were no comments.

IV. Consent Applications

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

A. [AHBR 25-120](#) 172 Aurora Street (Historic District)

Fence (6-foot, Cedar)

Attachments: [172 Aurora St. AHBR Packet](#)

This AHBR application was approved on the Consent Agenda.

B. [AHBR 25-73](#) 5947 Laurawood Lane

Accessory Structure (Shed)

Attachments: [5947 Laurawood Lane AHBR Packet](#)

This AHBR application was approved on the Consent Agenda.

V. Old Business

There was no Old Business.

A. [AHBR 25-65](#) 16 Owen Brown Street (Historic District)

Addition & Alterations (Bedroom, Dining room & Porches)

Submitted by Mark Madar

- a) *Staff notes this application was reviewed at the 2/12 and 2/26 meetings. The Board requested assistance of the Consultant (report attached).*
- b) *The applicant has made the following changes to reflect the comments from the Consultant Report:*
 - *Retaining the front door location on the historic mass.*
 - *Retaining the window locations on the left elevation of the historic mass. Staff notes the windows will be replaced with the Pella Lifestyle series, which is an approved window within the historic district. Question if the existing trim will remain as this is historic material.*
 - *Incorporating a wraparound porch that does not extend past the west and north walls of the house. Additionally, the applicant depicts the roof at a lower height to reflect the Board's suggestion at the February 26th AHBR meeting.*
 - *Incorporating a steeper roof pitch on the right elevation as well as aligning the second and first floor windows.*
 - *Depicts the use of hardi-board siding on the existing mass and the proposed additions.*
 - *Incorporating a gable roof on the proposed dormers on the left elevation as well as removing the small clerestory window.*
 - *Adjusting the proposed addition to depict an inset on the left elevation in order to comply with the National Park Service Preservation Briefs.*

Attachments:

[16 Owen Brown AHBR Packet 3.12 Meeting](#)

[16 Owen Brown AHBR Packet 2.26 Meeting](#)

[16 Owen Brown Consultant Report](#)

[16 Owen Brown AHBR Packet 2.12 Meeting](#)

Ms. Krickovich introduced the application by noting it was previously reviewed by AHBR and a site visit was conducted.

Mr. Mark Madar, homeowner, described how the revised application was driven by Historic Preservationist comments, including: The redesigned front porch, the gable roof above the front door, the use of lap siding, the west elevation gable dormers, aligning the windows, keeping the windows on the original part of the home, the rear elevation 10-inch inset, and on the east side, the windows alignment and the ridge line. Mr. Madar also noted the shutters by the door have been removed since at least the 1970s, and while the Preservationist recommended keeping the front door - it is in the middle of a room - and Mr. Madar would like eliminate it. It was also noted that all the windows are aluminum clad with wood on the interior.

The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed: The need for staff to review the proposed changes, having two or three windows on the front of the house, the location of the side door in relation to the front door, that the front door adds to the historic significance of the house, the roof type over the porch with needed decorative trims, and the possibility of putting a rail in front of the front door to minimize its look,

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Kenney, that this AHBR Application be continued to allow staff to review the revised elevations and submit comments to the Board. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

VI. New Business

A. [AHBR 25-123](#) 145 Aurora Street (Historic District)

Demolition & Accessory Structure (Detached Garage)

Submitted by Kody Kocias, Peninsula Architects

- a) *Staff notes this case was reviewed at the February 26th AHBR meeting. The Board requested a site visit, which was conducted on March 4th.*
- b) *Staff notes the applicant is requesting to demolish the existing accessory structure on the property. Based on the pictorial evidence the applicant provided and site visit observations, the Board could consider the following when making a decision:*
 - *The structure is technically contributing to the historic district based on the age of construction, but not historically significant. The exact age is undetermined, as it doesn't seem to be a 1920's building (per Summit County records).*
 - *The existing structure appears to have significant deterioration based on the pictures provided by the applicant and the site visit observations. Staff notes Appendix 1(6) states "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."*
- c) *Section I-2 of the Architectural Design Standards state "New buildings and alterations shall respect the existing context and framework. The design of any building shall be judged in reference to its site and the character of its surroundings, not as an independent object. The site plan for all new buildings shall be prepared with a clear understanding of the framework that exists or is being created in a particular area, through development standards, zoning and other regulations." Staff notes the existing garage was lower in height and setback farther from the side property line. Question if the new garage should depict a lower height to better accommodate existing and surrounding site conditions or could be set back to maintain a similar footprint.*
- d) *The Board requested the applicant relocate the door and window on the left elevation towards the center to better accommodate fenestration regulations. The applicant revised the drawings to depict this request.*

Attachments:

[145 Aurora AHBR Packet](#)

[145 Aurora AHBR Packet 3.12 Meeting](#)

Ms. Krickovich introduced the application by displaying and describing the existing detached garage, and reviewing the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Kody Kocias, and Mr. Joe Matava, Peninsula Architects, noted the building is in poor condition and falling down, stated they do not know the age of the building, and displayed photos of the existing shed with a bowing roof and rotten wood. The Board noted for demolition it must be demonstrated that the building does not have historic significance and

that the concrete block foundation is falling apart.

The Board, applicant, and staff, noted: The height and setbacks are within the code, the materials are natural wood and the windows are Pella Reserve. Mr. Matava noted: There is no water or electric in the building indicating it will not be used as a dwelling, why the windows are located in the shown positions, the large wall area with without fenestration and possible solutions, the possibility of moving the windows in from the wall to the middle to reduce the fenestration issue, and that this design matches the existing house better than the present shed.

A motion was made by Ms. Kenney, seconded by Mr. Ray, that this AHBR Application be continued. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

B. [AHBR 25-79](#) 252 North Main Street (Historic District)

Addition & Alteration to Accessory Structure (Barn)

Submitted by Stuart Hamilton

- a) *Staff notes this case was reviewed at the February 26th AHBR meeting. The Board requested a site visit that was conducted on March 4th.*
- b) *Appendix I(6) of the Secretary of Interior Standards state "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." The applicant is proposing to utilize existing materials and repurpose windows and doors.*
- c) *Appendix I(9) of the Secretary of Interior Standards states "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." Staff notes the applicant is proposing to remove historic siding to accommodate the new roof structures; however, the removed siding will replace the horizontal boards at the existing foundation.*

Attachments:

[252 N. Main AHBR Packet](#)

[252 N. Main AHBR Packet 3.12.25 Meeting](#)

Ms. Krickovich introduced the application by displaying and describing the elevations and project, describing the Secretary of the Interior's recommendations, and reviewing the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Stuart Hamilton, applicant, stated he will reuse boards down to the deck height, that the previous foundation failed, and that Summit County requires deck railing at 30-inches and this deck is 18-inches.

The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed: Conducting a site visit, that the new foundation used poured concrete, that a new frame was constructed on the inside of the barn, that the existing barn siding and windows will be reused, and that no materials will be purchased.

The Board decided to conduct a site visit.

This matter was continued

C. [AHBR 24-1258](#) 7559 Andover Way

Addition (3 Seasons Room)

Attachments: [7559 Andover Way AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Krickovich introduced the application by: Displaying the elevations, describing the project, noting that screens on the existing porch will be replaced with windows - which makes it an addition, and reviewing the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Kender, applicant, the Board, and staff, discussed: The required foundation, that windows will be installed and possibly removed for part of the year, that heat will not be included, the location of the stairs, that an exception will be needed to not require a foundation if this is considered an enclosed structure, the definition of an enclosed structure, the proposed type of windows and glass, that if only screens are used - the application is easier for the Board to approve, that a foundation will be built only under the new portion of the build, that a consistent foundation around the house is required by the building code, the view of the deck from the backyard will not allow the existing foundation to be seen if the new deck is built, that a veneer with regular deck skirting be used, that a combination of brick veneer and skirting be used around the deck, and that the roof will be re shingled in its entirety.

Mr. Workley made a motion, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, to approve the application with the following conditions: 1) A faux foundation be around the three sides of the new extended enclosure that matches the house. 2) To have skirting on the three sides of the expanded deck. 3) The roof be one consistent shingle. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

VII. Other Business**A. [AHBR 2-12-25](#) Minutes of Previous Architectural & Historic Board of Review Meeting: February 12, 2025.**

Attachments: [February 12, 2025 AHBR Minutes - Draft](#)

The minutes approval was postponed to the next AHBR meeting.

Aye: 7 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

VIII. Staff Update

Ms. Krickovich noted: 1) Three members of the Historic Landmark subcommittee will meet. 2) At Council's request AHBR's submittal requirements will be codified. 3) Text changes in the LDC regarding the Historic Consultant.

IX. Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Marzulla, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, that the meeting be adjourned at 8:49 p.m.. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Ms. Manko

John Caputo, Chair

John Workley, Secretary

Joe Campbell, Executive Assistant

Upon approval by the Architectural & Historic Board of Review, this official written summary of the meeting minutes shall become a permanent record, and the official minutes shall also consist of a permanent audio and video recording, excluding executive sessions, in accordance with Codified Ordinances, Section 252.04, Minutes of Architectural and Historic Board of Review, Board of Zoning and Building Appeals, and Planning Commission.

* * *