



# City of Hudson, Ohio

## CD Meeting Agenda - Final 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, April 23, 2025

7:30 PM

Town Hall  
27 East Main Street

---

**I. Call To Order**

**II. Roll Call**

**III. Public Comment**

**IV. Consent Applications**

- A. [AHBR 25-354](#) 72 Village Way**  
Alteration (Siding, Doors, Windows)  
Submitted by Cecilia McDermott  
a) *Staff recommends approval as submitted.*  
Attachments: [72 Village Way AHBR Packet](#)
- B. [AHBR 25-301](#) 7490 Andover Way**  
Addition (In-law Suite)  
Submitted by Mark Collins  
a) *Staff recommends approval as submitted.*  
Attachments: [7490 Andover Way AHBR Packet](#)
- C. [AHBR 25-153](#) 7534 S. Vinemont Ct.**  
Accessory Structure (Pavillion)  
Submitted by Schott Dohner  
a) *Staff recommends approval as submitted.*  
Attachments: [7534 S. Vinemont AHBR Packet](#)

**V. Old Business**

**A. [AHBR 25-238](#) 1980 Christine Drive**

New Construction (Single-Family Dwelling)

Submitted by Tony Lunardi, LDA Builders

- a) *Staff notes this case was reviewed at the April 9th AHBR meeting.*
- b) *The Board requested the applicant revise the plans to depict the walk-in closet wing be behind the main mass or be a projection of maximum of 5 feet. The applicant did revise plans to show the 5-foot projection.*
- c) *The Board also requested the applicant explore aligning the windows on the left elevation as this side is in the public view. The applicant did submit revised plan depicting this change.*
- d) *Question how the front windows will meet the porch roof.*

Attachments: [1980 Christine Dr. AHBR Packet 4.23 Meeting](#)  
[1980 Christine Dr. AHBR Packet](#)

Legislative History

4/9/25 Architectural & Historic Board continued  
of Review

**VI. New Business****A. [AHBR 25-280](#) 219 N. Main Street (Denim & Design)**

Sign (Building)

Submitted by Marianne Minogue

- a) *Section V-4(a) of the Architectural Design Standards state “The lettering within a sign panel should not exceed approximately 70 % of the height and length of the sign panel” Reduce the size of the lettering within the sign panel to provide additional space to meet this requirement.*
- b) *Section V-5(c) of the Architectural Design Standards state “Signs should be fabricated on and of materials that are of permanent quality, good durability and are complimentary to the building of which they become a part.” Question the use of a metal panel is appropriate as this location is within the Historic District.*
- c) *Question if the sign is accurately depicted on the drawing.*

Attachments: [219 N. Main Street AHBR Packet](#)

**B. [AHBR 25-331](#) 13 S. Oviatt St. (Historic District)**

Alteration (Roof Replacement)

Submitted by Bill Buehl

- a) *The applicant is requesting to replace a portion of the shingled roof area with like shingles and replace the low slope roof areas with a self-adhered membrane.*
- b) *Staff notes the applicant is proposing to use a dimensional shingle on one slope side while the existing 3-tab would remain on the other sloped side of the roof pitch. Question the use of two different styles on the same roof.*

Attachments: [13 S. Oviatt AHBR Packet](#)

**C. [AHBR 25-368](#) 55 N. Ovatt (Historic District)**

Addition (Enclosure of existing porch)

Submitted by Chris Lachman, CSL Consulting

- a) *Staff notes the applicant is proposing to enclose with windows the existing open porch on the N. Oviatt side of the house.*
- b) *The Preservation Briefs speaks on historic porches and states “If a porch enclosure is being considered, its significance and location - as well as the nature of the planned enclosure - play key roles in whether it can be done without changing the porch’s and building’s historic character. While it is almost never appropriate to enclose a front porch on a historic building to create interior space, enclosing a less prominent porch on a less visible elevation could have less impact.” Staff notes this porch is on an addition that was put on in the 90’s; however, question the design and if it is appropriate for a visible porch in the Historic District.*
- c) *Submit specification cut sheets on the windows, doors, and siding detail.*
- d) *Question the aesthetics of the porch when the windows are open.*
- e) *Staff suggests the AHBR take this meeting to understand the project, ask questions, set up a site visit and request assistance from the Historic Consultant.*

Attachments: [55 N. Ovatt AHBR Packet](#)

[Preservation Briefs on Wood Porches](#)

**D. [AHBR 25-353](#) 7487 Darrow Road**

Addition (Enclosed Porch)

Submitted by Robert Duber

- a) *Section IV-4(h)(1) of the Architectural Design Standards state “An additional wing may be added to any mass of the building. This wing must be attached at the rear or side of the building and may not extend forward of the main body.” Staff notes this wing would be projecting from the front façade facing Middleton Road. Revise plans to depict the proposal on the side or rear of the house.*
- b) *Section IV-4(h)(3) of the Architectural Design Standards state “Additions should be designed to be compatible with the main structure by incorporating materials and a foundation to match.” Staff notes the proposed materials would not be compatible with the main house.*
- c) *Section IV-4(c) of the Architectural Design Standards state “All roofs in all the wings must be of the same shape as the main body, but they may have a different pitch or orientation. Roofs shall not intersect a wall so as to cause a valley.” The proposal has a shed roof while the existing has a gable roof.*

Attachments: [7487 Darrow Rd. AHBR Packet](#)

**E. [AHBR 25-152](#) 148 West Prospect**

Addition & Alteration

Submitted by Kline Home Exteriors

- a) *Section IV-4(g) of the Architectural Design Standards states “Roofs on projections should match the roof material of the building (unless both roofs are flat) and to the extent possible, shall be same kind of roof. Natural finish metals such as copper, terne coated steel, or lead may be substituted for any roofing material.” And “Materials used on an open porch or screen room need not be the same as other materials in the structure, but should be related to materials used in the details of the structure.” Staff notes the proposal depicts a metal roof while the main house is shingled.*
- b) *Question how the proposed screens on the rear porch will tie into the ground*
- c) *Confirm all window openings will remain and no new opening are proposed.*
- d) *Question the proposed exposed foundation and if it is consistently applied on all elevations.*
- e) *Submit specification sheets of the proposed hardi-board siding and exposed foundation material.*

**Attachments:** [148 W. Prospect AHBR Packet](#)

**VII. Other Business**

- A. [AHBR-Submittal Requirements](#) **Discussion of Planning Commission Subcommittee - Review of Appendix A - Submittal Requirements**

**Attachments:** [Staff Memo - PC subcommittee - AHBR Submittal Requirements](#)

**VIII. Staff Update**

**IX. Adjournment**

\* \* \*

*The mission of the Hudson City Government is to serve, promote and support, in a fiscally responsible manner, an outstanding community that values quality of life, a well-balanced tax base, historic preservation, with a vision to the future, and professionalism in volunteer and public service.*