

To: Nick Sugar, City Planner and Amanda Krickovich, Community Development, City of Hudson
From: Olivia Hopkins, AIA & Alice Sloan, Assoc. AIA, APT-RP | Historic Architecture, Perspectus
Date: September 5, 2024
Re: 27 College Street
CC: Lauren Pinney Burge, AIA, Principal | Historic Architecture, Perspectus

SUBJECT PROPERTY: 27 College 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 September 3, 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 structure:

1. Constructing, at the rear (east) elevation, a two-story addition.
 - a. **Massing:** The proposed addition will be visible from the side (south) elevation, as the house is located at the corner of College Street and Church Street. The overall addition will be adding roughly 1,300 SF to the property. The mass of the proposed addition has a rectangular footprint extending to the rear (east) of the historic house. There is an east/west facing gable and a side (south) facing shed roof with a shed roof dormer. The side (south) façade, which is visible from Church Street, is stepped back from the historic side (south) wall roughly 3 feet. The side (south) shed roof is at the same elevation height as the historic front (west) facing gable. The rear (east) elevation has a shed roof covered porch with stairs on the rear (east) side, which is visible from the side (south) elevation on Church Street. The rear (east) facing gable at the first floor has a boxed bay window with a shed roof. The proposed side (north) elevation is aligned with the historic house wall. The side (north) has a single door at the rear with a double-sided east/west staircase. The staircase is visible from the front (west) elevation off College Street. The proposed roof ridge line is aligned with the historic house's roofline.
 - b. **Materials:** The new addition will remove historic painted wood shingle siding from the rear (east) wall of the house for the new connection of the addition to the existing house. The existing windows on the historic rear wall are replacement vinyl windows but retain the original decorative wood casing. The proposed materials of the addition are cedar shake siding to match existing exposure and Azek (blend of PVC and other materials) or Boral (blend of polymers and coal combustion products, ash) trim, painted to match existing. As stated at the site visit, the proposed addition's foundation would either be smooth faced CMU or rusticated CMU, as the existing foundation has both; also, the proposed addition will feature wood windows and an asphalt roof. The proposed windows at the side (south) elevation on the first floor are a 1 over 1 double hung window, and a

paired 1 over 1 double hung window. These windows will align with the head height of one of the existing vinyl replacement windows on the historic house. The proposed window at the side (south) elevation on the second floor is a paired 1 over 1 double hung window. The proposed door at the rear (east) covered porch is a wood single door, which is the existing rear door relocated to this location. The rear boxed bay window on the side (north and south) elevations have a one lite cased opening window. The rear (east) elevation of the boxed bay has a paired 1 over 1 double hung window. The rear (east) elevation on the second floor has a paired 1 over 1 double hung window centered on the boxed bay. The first floor on the side (north) elevation will have a new paired 1 over 1 double hung window and a new square fixed window. The head height of these windows is slightly above the existing window head heights. The existing first floor vinyl replacement window on the side (north) facing wing will be removed and replaced with a new fixed square wood window placed to the right of the existing opening. The existing window opening will be infilled with cedar shake siding to match. The second floor will have three 1 over 1 windows in the addition and a new fixed square casement window in the north facing wing. Note the existing house has a (smooth) painted wood shingle siding which differs from a shake siding which has a more textured surface.

- c. Detailing: The rear (east) facing gable has a decorative rake trim to match the historic front gable trim. The rear (east) porch design will match the front porch with the lattice skirting, decorative railing and columns and side brackets. The side (north) staircase will have decorative railings to match the front porch.
2. Removing, at the rear (east) elevation, the brick chimney.
3. Replacing, at the side (north) elevation, the covered porch that appears to have been previously altered with an enclosed addition. The proposed design will maintain the overall massing of the porch and roof however the porch will be removed and replaced with cedar shake sided walls to match existing exposure and paint. The front (west) facing façade will have a square fixed window. Note this massing is visible from the front (west) elevation.
4. Removing, at the rear (east) elevation, the non-historic roof overhang above the door.
5. Relocating, at the rear (east) elevation, the non-historic wood door to the newly built covered porch door.
6. Note we are not addressing concerns related to the addition's setback on the property.

APPROPRIATENESS OF PROPOSED CHANGES

1. **Proposed changes #1-2 are not appropriate** because it prevents the existing historic house from dominating the massing; removes what appears to be historic materials from the rear, and inappropriately replicates historic detailing.
 - a. Massing: The addition will almost double the square footage of the existing historic house that was originally built for workers at the local cheese company. The existing square footage of the historic house is 1,408 sf. The proposed square footage of the addition is approximately 1,302 sf. This will make the combined square footage of the house 2,710 sf. This does not comply with Standard #9 and Preservation Brief #14 (New work shall be...compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment). Note that the view from the side along Church Street is within the public realm and should be taken into account when reviewing the overall massing of the addition. The proposed addition does not allow the existing historic house to dominate the property: the roof ridge line of the proposed addition is in line with the historic roof ridgeline; and the side (north) elevation of the addition is in line with the historic house which does not create visual separation when viewing the house south on College Street. Further, the new double-sided staircase will be visible from College Street.
 - b. Material Removal: The proposed addition does not comply with Standard #2 (The removal of historic materials...that characterize a property shall be avoided) due to the removal of the historic shingle siding, wood window casing, and brick chimney. While the existing windows are replacement vinyl, the other materials on this elevation are historic. Further, these changes do not comply with Standard #10 (New additions...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).
 - c. Detailing: The intricate detailing of the proposed rear (east) covered porch, the side (north) staircase, and rake trim to match the front trim should be simplified to comply with Standard #9 (the new work shall be differentiated from the old). Also, consider using a lap siding of the same exposure as the existing historic painted wood shingle siding in order to simplify and differentiate a proposed new addition from the historic house. Further, consider using smooth-faced CMU at the proposed addition to differentiate from the historic rock-faced concrete block foundation.

2. **Proposed change #3: can become appropriate** because the new mass of the enclosed addition mimics the overall size and shape of the existing covered porch. Ensure the roof height, slope, and offset from the side (north) wall match the existing roof. Match the existing side (north) inset from the north facing wing with the new wall.
3. **Proposed changes #'s 4-5: are appropriate and compliant.**

SOURCES CONSULTED

1. AHBR Agenda Packet with OHI Form and proposed drawings by Hara Architects.
2. AHBR Meeting Agenda Minutes, 27 College Street, 8/28/2024.
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 2022.
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. McAlester, Virginia. *A Field Guide to American Houses*. Fifth printing, Alfred A. Knopf, 2020.
7. National Register of Historic Place Form by Thirza M. Cady, Asst. to Janet Sprague. *Hudson Historic District Reference Number 73001542*. April 7, 1973.
8. National Register of Historic Place Form by Lois Newkirk. *Hudson Historic District (Boundary Increase) Reference Number 89001452*. August 19, 1989.
9. National Register of Historic Place Form by Wendy Naylor and Diana Wellman. *Hudson Historic District (Boundary Increase) Reference Number 100007849*. April 15, 2022.

FINDINGS

1. The structure is located in and contributing to the Hudson National Register Historic District, reference number 100007849 (superseding 73001542 and 89001452). 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 2022 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 2022 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 house at 27 College Street, was part of the 1973 National Register District. The OHI form states the house is, "Thought to be one of a group of houses built at the south end of College Street by or for workers at Seymour Straights cheese enterprises in the late 1800s."
2. The property is located on the east side of the street, on the corner of College Street and Church Street in the Historic Residential Neighborhood Zoning District. The terrain is flat.
3. According to the Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI), the front part of the structure (east-west oriented wing) dates to c1873, because the OHI states "front section older". Based upon the foundation material, the rear north-south oriented wing appears to date to the 1910s and 1920s
4. The structure is approximately T-shaped in plan and 1 ½ stories tall. The structure has painted wood shingle siding. The windows are replacement vinyl. The foundation is a mix of smooth faced concrete block that appears to date to the 1950s and, according to the OHI, replaced the original foundation material; and rock-faced cast stone (concrete block) popular during the 1910s and 1920s. The structure has influences from the Gothic Revival style.



Image 1: 1950. Photograph. Courtesy of the City of Hudson and Hudson Library & Historical Society.



Image 2: Southwest corner.



Image 3: Front (west) elevation. The red box indicates the covered side porch that appears to have been previously altered and is proposed to be enclosed.



Image 4: Side (south) elevation. This view is from the public realm.



Image 5: Rear (east) elevation. This view is from the public realm.



Image 6: Rear (east) elevation looking west on Church Street. This view is from the public realm.



Image 7: Side (north) elevation. The red box indicates the covered side porch that appears to have been previously altered and is proposed to be enclosed.



Image 8: Side (north) elevation. The red box indicates the covered side porch that appears to have been previously altered and is proposed to be enclosed. The green box indicates the window to be replaced and moved.



Image 9: Neighboring house to the north of 27 College Street.



Image 10: Houses across College Street.



Image 11: House across Church Street.

END OF REPORT

EXHIBIT A: City of Hudson, Codified Ordinances Appendix D. - Architectural Design Standards

To Nick Sugar, City Planner and Amanda Krickovich, Community Development, City of Hudson

From Olivia Hopkins, AIA & Alice Sloan, Assoc. AIA, APT-RP | Historic Architecture, Perspectus

CC: Lauren Pinney Burge, AIA, Principal | Historic Architecture, Perspectus

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).

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

To Nick Sugar, City Planner and Amanda Krickovich, Community Development, City of Hudson
From Olivia Hopkins, AIA & Alice Sloan, Assoc. AIA, APT-RP | Historic Architecture, Perspectus
CC: Lauren Pinney Burge, AIA, Principal | Historic Architecture, Perspectus

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.