



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Final Architectural & Historic Board of Review

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

Nicholas Sugar, City Planner
Lauren Coffman, Associate Planner

Wednesday, April 8, 2026

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: 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 1 - Ms. Manko

III. Public Comment

Chair Caputo opened the meeting for Public Comment.

Ms. Chris Winter of 152 Hudson Street stated that she believes the AHRB has shown inconsistencies regarding the demolition of 159 Hudson Street, noting that the property is not located within the Historic District. She expressed confusion about why the demolition was permitted while other homes of similar age in the surrounding area were not granted the same consideration. Ms. Winter requested an explanation from the AHBR on this issue. She also raised concerns about what she perceives as inconsistent enforcement of regulations, citing examples such as non-wood windows being approved in her neighborhood and certain sheds being permitted that she believes would not have been allowed in the past. She again asked for clarification.

Ms. Winter additionally noted that the April 8th agenda includes another demolition request and expressed concern about potential flooding issues related to an additional driveway.

Seeing no others wishing to speak, Chair Caputo closed Public Comment.

IV. Consent Applications

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, that this be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 1 - Ms. Manko

[AHBR 26-207](#) **6598 Stone Rd**

Accessory Structure (Pavilion)

Attachments: [6598 Stone Rd - AHBR Packet](#)

This AHBR application was approved on the Consent Agenda.

[AHBR 25-1505](#) **50 W Streetsboro St**

Sign (Ground Sign)

Attachments: [50 W Streetsboro St - AHBR Packet](#)

This AHBR application was approved on the Consent Agenda.

V. Old Business

[AHBR 2022-735](#) **5530 Stonecreek Way**

New House Alterations (Windows, Trim and Material Changes)

Attachments: [5530 Stonecreek Way - AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying and describing the revised elevations and the overall project, along with a review of the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Maher Holozadah, speaking on behalf of the applicant, explained the reasoning behind removing the freeze board and selecting the proposed window grids. He also noted that the stone installed above the transom window was intended to help highlight that feature and described the type of synthetic stone that was used.

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed several points, including confirmation that the height of the turret remains as previously approved. They reviewed the area to the left of the entryway's upper window where siding had been replaced with stone, noting that the surfaces are not on the same plane. They also considered whether the stone terminates at an inside corner on all sides, and reiterated that although the standards are not being met in this instance, the affected area is small. Concerns were raised that the black tile above the windows within the stone section does not match the surrounding stone, and that exceptions should not be granted after the fact simply because work has already been completed.

Mr. Holozadah explained that using siding in that small area caused it to appear as an isolated patch, whereas the Board emphasized that the standards require stone in that location to be applied consistently around the full mass.

Ms. Kenney made a motion, seconded by Mr. Workley, to approve the change in the window design, allow the freeze boards to remain uninstalled since they are not required by the standards, and require that the applied stone in the small triangular area be removed and replaced with the previously approved siding. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 1 - Ms. Manko

[AHBR 25-1022](#) **41 E. Main Street (Historic District)**

Commercial Addition (Office and Storage Space)

Attachments: [41 E Main Street - AHBR Packet](#)
[Preservation Brief #14](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying and describing the project, noting that the Planning Commission has approved it and that the AHBR previously held an informal review. She also reviewed the staff comments.

Ms. Melissa Swearinger of Peninsula Architects described the project, its purpose, and how the proposed design fits within the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Steve Plovich, the historic project manager, explained that several design details have been drawn from the existing building, including the paneling on the Division Street side, the use of large trim elements, the choice of outswing carriage doors rather than an overhead door, and the plan to replace a portion of the plywood soffit with tongue-and-groove soffit.

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed the use of wood trim instead of composite materials, noting that the gutter buckets were intentionally designed to enhance the project's character. Photographs were shown to illustrate certain corner board details and the panels below the windows intended to break up the front façade. Concerns were raised that the intricacy of the addition's design may be excessive when viewed from the Division Street side in relation to the existing house. They also discussed the design of the carriage house doors, the project's role in easing the visual transition from commercial to residential uses, the plan to use matching sandstone for the foundation, updates needed for the materials schedule to reflect the approved materials, and the treatment of the gable end returns.

Mr. Workley made a motion, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, to approve the project as submitted, with the condition that the doors be detailed for review by staff, that the materials list be revised and approved by staff, and that the soffit be replaced with in-kind materials. The motion was approved by the following vote:

[AHBR](#)
[2025-1478](#)

88 N Main Street (Historic District)

Alterations (Door Replacement)

Attachments: [88 N. Main Street - Letter to AHBR](#)
[88 N Main Street - Proposed Door Photos](#)
[88 N Main St - AHBR Packet 3.11.2026](#)

Ms. Sugar requested the application be tabled and noted it will be voted on at the next meeting.

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

Aye: 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 1 - Ms. Manko

[AHBR 2025-986](#) **6050 Pine Ridge Trail**

Alteration (Windows, Chimney, Foundation)

Attachments:[6050 Pine Ridge Trl - AHBR Packet](#)[6050 Pine Ridge - AHBR Packet 9.10.25 Final Approved](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by noting that it was previously approved by the AHBR at the September 10, 2025 meeting, that revised elevations have since been submitted, and she reviewed the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. John Russell and Elaine Schmidt of Prestige Builders Group were present for the meeting.

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed several items, including the chimney, which is proposed to be changed to stone, and the sloping stone watertable, which currently appears to function as a foundation and needs to be corrected. They also addressed whether the one-foot, five-inch window bump-out may require its own foundation.

Mr. Russell requested that the Board approve an additional metal roof, which he believes will create a more consistent appearance for the structure.

The Board then discussed making the foundation and watertable on the opposite side of the front elevation match the appearance of the sloped wall foundation.

Mr. Workley made a motion, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, to approve the application with the following conditions: that the chimney material be changed to brick; that the windows and the one-foot, five-inch window bump-out be approved; that the back porch sloped wall be revised to include a concrete separation between the foundation portion and the railing area; and that a third metal shed roof be permitted. The motion was approved by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 1 - Ms. Manko

[AHBR 2025-3633 E Streetsboro Street \(Historic District\)](#)**Windows**

Alteration (Windows)

Attachments:[33 E Streetsboro St - AHBR Packet 3.11.2026](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying photos of the house, reviewing the project's history, and summarizing the staff comments.

Ms. Tracey Crawford, the applicant, was present for the meeting.

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed that the window request pertains to a new construction, and that simulated divided windows are typically required in such cases. Ms. Crawford noted that the remodeler of the Akron Beacon Building had used the Andersen windows she is requesting and received credits from the State of Ohio for doing so. She also remarked that the Chagrin Falls AHBR has deemed wood clad aluminum windows acceptable.

A motion was made by Ms. Kenney, who noted that her recommendation is based on the fact that this is new construction, and was seconded by Mr. Workley, to approve the AHBR application as amended by requiring simulated dividers in the windows. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 1 - Ms. Manko

VI. New Business

[AHBR 26-204](#) **29 E. Streetsboro St (Historic District)**

Accessory Structure (Detached Garage)

Attachments: [29 E. Streetsboro Street - AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying the project elevations and reviewing the staff comments.

Ms. Tracey Crawford and Mr. Alan Sveta, the applicants, were present for the meeting.

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed the proposed concrete block foundation material.

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

Aye: 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 1 - Ms. Manko

[AHBR 26-153](#) **40 Roslyn Ave (Historic District)**

Alteration (Window Replacement)

Attachments: [40 Roslyn Ave - AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying photos of the house, reviewing the history of the project, and summarizing the staff comments.

Mr. David Thomas, the owner, was present for the meeting.

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed the combination of vinyl and aluminum windows currently on the house, as well as the fact that the proposed windows are aluminum clad.

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

Aye: 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 1 - Ms. Manko

[AHBR 26-84](#) **6142 Independence Dr**

Addition (Garage Addition and Renovation)

Attachments: [6142 Independence Dr - AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying the project elevations and reviewing the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Robert Cogdeill of Roberts Construction agreed to place a window on the back of the garage, explained that a television is planned for the area under the proposed shed roof, and confirmed that shutters will be added to the south elevation.

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed the window that meets the wall for egress from the second floor bedroom, the possibility of adjusting the pitch of the garage roof, and the conclusion that the shed roof does no harm.

A motion was made by Ms. Kenney, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, to approve the AHBR application as amended, requiring that a window be added to the back of the garage, that shutters be installed on all windows, and that the shed roof be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Nay: 1 - Mr. Workley

Absent: 1 - Ms. Manko

[AHBR 26-101](#) **200 Laurel Lake Dr**
New House (Villas)

Attachments: [200 Laurel Lake Dr - Villas - AHBR Packet](#)
[200 Laurel Lake Dr - Villa Staff Comments](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by noting that it has received approvals from the Planning Commission and the BZBA, was informally reviewed by the AHBR on February 24, 2024, and then reviewed the staff recommendations.

Mr. Donna Anderson of Laurel Lake and Mr. John Ducatman of RDL Architects reviewed the history of the application, explaining that the original plan for nine structures has been reduced to seven. Mr. Ducatman described the current proposed locations of the structures.

The Board, the applicant, and staff began their discussion with the Cuyahoga Villa, noting the front-facing garages and acknowledging that existing duplexes in the development also have front-facing garages. Mr. Sugar observed that the garage might be able to be set back further. They discussed the requirement that materials terminate at inside corners and considered the possibility of enlarging the columns to meet this standard. They discussed the consistency of trim on the windows, with the exception of locations where full-height stone surrounds a window. They further noted that the hip roofs could be eliminated and discussed the potential removal of the circular arch element on the rear of the structure.

The Board, the applicant, and staff also discussed how a garage facing a development road, rather than a public road, is interpreted under the standards. Mr. Sugar described relevant provisions of the LDC and the Architectural Standards, and the Board discussed them in the context of the existing development and its established neighborhood character.

The Board noted that some decisions made for the Cuyahoga Villa would also apply to the other villa styles.

Villa 2 was then reviewed, a single-family house with a side-loading garage. Mr. Ducatman noted that larger windows, consistent with the rest of the building, could be installed, and he proceeded to review the remaining staff comments. The Board did not offer additional comments.

Villa 3, a rendition of Villa 4 with a condensed floor plan, was then discussed. Mr. Ducatman reviewed the staff comments, which will be reviewed further by his team. The Board discussed the large expanse on the second story without fenestration and noted that creative solutions to address the lack of windows would be acceptable.

Villa 4 was reviewed next. Mr. Ducatman again reviewed the staff comments as he had for the previous villas. The Board had no further comments.

Villa 5 was then reviewed, with Mr. Ducatman addressing the staff comments in the same manner as before. The Board questioned the right-side rake boards, and Mr. Ducatman suggested that the discrepancy might be due to a computer design error.

Villas 8 and 9 were then discussed. Mr. Ducatman noted that the designs had been slightly revised to align more closely with the existing adjacent gables. The Board asked about the skylights, and Mr. Ducatman explained that they would sit above the roof surface with a flashing mechanism.

The Board suggested that the massing of the garages and the gable designs be revised for the next meeting.

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

Aye: 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 1 - Ms. Manko

VII. Other Business

[AHBR 8493](#) **159 Hudson Street (Informal)**

New House (Single-Family Dwelling)

Attachments: [159 Hudson Street - AHBR Informal Packet 4.8.2026](#)
[159 Hudson St - AHBR Informal Packet 2.11.2026](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by noting that it had been informally reviewed previously and then presented the revised designs.

Mr. Brendan Boatwright of McAlpine House was present for the meeting.

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed allowable impervious surfaces and the question of the main mass of the house. Mr. Boatwright expressed his view that the current design is consistent with neighboring homes. Mr. Sugar clarified how the main mass and wing masses are defined under the LDC. The Board noted that the issue is not the overall height of the structure, but rather that the wings are taller than the main mass. They discussed the possibility of raising the dormers and reviewed the LDC requirement that the main mass project eighteen inches forward of the wings. They also discussed the need for a consistent foundation and considered possible ways to create separation between the foundation and the walls. The Board emphasized that because this is new construction, the LDC should be followed and noted that many of the Hudson LDC standards are not being met. They also discussed the likelihood that no watertable line exists on this house because it is all brick, and agreed that the two towers should be moved back and lowered.

Mr. Boatwright discussed the proposed roof pitches, and staff raised the question of whether there is a dominant siding material.

Staff noted that this section of Hudson Street, and this house in particular, are not located in the Historic District and are not designated as a Landmark property. Staff then explained why this house may not have been included within the Historic District boundaries.

This matter was discussed

[AHBR 8545](#) 5 Thirty Acres Ln (Informal)

Addition (Kitchen, Master Bedroom, Bathrooms, and Garage)

Attachments: [5 Thirty Acres Ln - AHBR Informal Review Packet](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying the project elevations.

Mr. Matt Plecnik of Cleveland Draw Architecture and Melissa, the homeowner, explained that a portion of the front of the house and the veranda will be demolished and rebuilt within the same footprint, maintaining the same number of columns and the same appearance. The railing will be redesigned to meet current building codes. The proposed addition will be located on the left side of the house and will include aluminum siding, a garage, and a small living area. The roof of the addition will match the existing roof. The kitchen addition will feature large open windows and a deck with a roof, accessible from the kitchen. Mr. Plecnik acknowledged that the proposed addition is larger than the original structure.

The Board expressed concern that the scale of the addition is out of context with the surrounding neighborhood, noting that it would be significantly larger than nearby homes and, as one Board member commented, could make the neighboring houses appear like servant quarters. It was also noted that several houses in the neighborhood are being considered for historic recognition, though the subject house is not designated as historic. Melissa explained that the veranda is being rebuilt due to its deteriorated condition.

The Board discussed the possibility of making the proposed addition a detached structure. The applicant explained that the scope of the project includes new bedrooms for young children, making a detached configuration impractical. The applicant asked whether removing the ten-foot walkthrough connection might make the addition more acceptable.

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed the lack of interior access to the second floor from the front portion of the house and explored potential solutions. The applicant stated that the existing garage is in poor condition. They also discussed the Chippendale-style railing and the potential to replicate that style in a code-compliant way. The applicant noted that the existing railing may have been added later in the home's history.

The discussion then turned to the possibility of adding a consistent-height watertable around the house. Given that the existing structure does not have a watertable, the Board considered how such a feature might be incorporated. It was noted that separating the addition into a detached structure would remove the requirement for the existing house to include a watertable.

This matter was discussed

[AHBR 8537](#) 258 N. Main Street (Historic District) (Informal)

Addition (Bedroom, Bathroom, Office, and 2-Car Garage)

Attachments: [258 N. Main Street - AHBR Informal Packet 4.8.2026 Meeting](#)[258 N Main Street - AHBR Informal Submittal](#)[258 N Main - Photos](#)[Preservation Brief #14- exterior additions](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying elevations of the house, reviewing the history of the project, and summarizing the staff comments.

Mr. Nate Bailey of Hara Architects described the history of the home, noting that multiple

additions have been made over the years. He explained that the scale and massing may pose challenges within the neighborhood context and discussed the feasibility of the proposed garage given the grade of the property. Mr. Bailey also highlighted the existing retaining wall, describing it as an unattractive feature in the neighborhood. He noted that the watertable, as it appears across the various previous additions and the proposed new addition, is also problematic. Because the garage sits low on the property, there is a large expanse of parged foundation-like material; the applicant presented options to lessen the visual prominence of this area.

Mr. Bailey then reviewed the revised elevations, which incorporate design changes intended to give the addition more of a carriage-house appearance, as well as the breezeway that would connect the house to the garage.

The Board and the applicant discussed the connector area being set back from the main wall plane and confirmed that the proposed primary siding material will match the existing siding as closely as possible. The Board expressed the view that the siding should be of a consistent size. They also discussed the possibility of continuing a freeze board around the structures, with different siding materials above and below it. The Board raised questions about whether an exception to the foundation requirements might be appropriate, and whether granting such exceptions would set a precedent. Staff suggested that if an exception were granted, it might be tied to both the visibility of the foundation and the historic nature of the house.

This matter was discussed

[AHBR 8570](#)

**179 Elm Street (Historic District) (Informal)
Demolition (Single-Family Dwelling)**

Attachments: [179 Elm Street - AHBR Informal Packet 4.8.2026](#)
[Elm Street Boundary Increase Application](#)

Mr. Nate Bailey of Peninsula Architects expressed his desire for a discussion regarding whether the structure is or is not considered contributing to the Historic District.

Mr. Bailey noted that the National Register of Historic Places provides criteria for local officials to use when determining contributing status and then listed the criteria on which such determinations are based. He reviewed the history of the house, explaining that it was built in 1952, whereas the neighboring homes were constructed in the 1940s.

Mr. Bailey stated that no evidence has been found connecting the house to a significant event or person, and that it does not exhibit significant architectural features. He explained that renovating the house is not feasible-adding a second floor would not be permitted, adding a basement is not practical, and the structure is in severe disrepair. He noted that the neighbors support demolition because the home does not contribute positively to the district's character and is currently used as a rental property. He further stated that the house is unlikely to yield any significant historical information. According to Mr. Bailey, the new owners wish to build a new home on the site.

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed the locations of the two homes that were demolished previously, as well as the two homes on Oviatt Street. They also discussed the prior Board's request to understand what would be built before approving demolition and expressed a desire to conduct a site visit before voting. The Board emphasized the importance of understanding the home's context within the historic neighborhood and determining whether it contributes to the area's character. Mr. Sugar noted the application for this area to be added to the Historic District, including this house. Mr. Bailey reiterated that, for the house to be contributing, it must hold significance for the City of Hudson.

The Board discussed the potential ramifications of permitting demolition. Mr. Bailey read a statement explaining that the majority of homes in the District must retain their historic significance and argued that removal of one house would not be significant. The rationale for previously allowing demolition on North Oviatt Street was discussed. Mr. Bailey asked the Board to keep an open mind until a site visit is conducted. Mr. Sugar stated that a historic consultant could be contacted for an opinion and that Mr. Bailey may also submit his own consultant's assessment.

VIII. Staff Update

Mr. Sugar updated the Board on meetings to be held with HHA and residents as to the meaning of becoming part of the Historic District.

The Board discussed the AHBRs authority over the bandstand area on Main Street.

This matter was discussed

[AHBR 3.11.2026](#) **Minutes of Previous Architectural & Historic Board of Review Meeting: March 11, 2026**

Attachments: [March 11, 2026 AHBR Meeting Minutes - Draft](#)

There were not enough members at the March 11, 2026, meeting to conduct a vote.

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, that this Minutes be postponed to a date certain Architectural & Historic Board of Review, due back on 4/22/2026. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 1 - Ms. Manko

IX. Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Marzulla, seconded by Mr. Workley, that the meeting be adjourned at 11:31 pm. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 1 - 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.

* * *