



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Draft 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, February 11, 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: 7 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski, Mr. Brown and Ms. Manko

III. Public Comment

Ms. Susan Nemmens, representing the Hudson Heritage Association, reported that she attended an AHBR workshop on historical standards and materials. She provided a review of the history of the existing Bandstand on Main Street and expressed concerns about the proposed changes for the new bandstand. Specifically, Ms. Nemmens questioned the design, size, and proposed materials, and encouraged the AHBR to carefully review the project in light of Hudson's historical standards and the bandstand's prominent location.

She also noted that the current website does not accurately reflect the proposed changes, including the addition of a stage at the top of the gazebo. Furthermore, Ms. Nemmens raised concerns about the accelerated timeline for the project, stating that residents do not have a clear understanding of the proposed work.

Seeing no one else coming forward, Chair Caputo closed Public Comments.

IV. Consent Applications

There were no applications on the Consent Agenda.

V. Old Business

A. [AHBR 25-1478](#) 88 N Main Street (Historic District)

Alterations (Hanging sign & door replacements)

Ms. Coffman opened the discussion by reviewing the revised sign application along with staff comments.

Attorney Joseph Kerman, representing Kapners Tavern, and Ms. Arnold, Kepners Tavern, explained that the proposed sign will be made of wood and handcrafted. Ms. Arnold added that the new sign will be nearly identical to the previous one, with only minor wording changes. She emphasized that it will be hand-carved, feature a routed edge, and include no vinyl graphics.

Turning to the doors, Mr. Kerman noted that the former doors were originally designed for a residence and not suitable for a commercial property, particularly in terms of security. He explained that the old doors did not close properly, and the owner was advised to install doors that resemble others along Main Street. He also pointed out that the side door is only visible when walking down the alleyway.

Staff reported finding a previous permit for the front door but no documentation for the side door. The Board, staff, and applicants then discussed the enlargement of the door opening. Ms. Arnold clarified that when the previous door was installed, extra trim was added to accommodate the residential door, whereas the current installation restores the original opening. It was also noted that: The type of door prior to the previous installation is unknown, the transom remains unchanged, and the current door is contemporary in style, which does not conform to historic standards.

Chair Caputo reminded the group that the owner participated in an informal AHBR review regarding the front door replacement. Mr. Kerman stated the door needed to be replaced for security reasons and argued that many doors on Main Street resemble the new one. He stated that the owners will work to make the doors appear more historically appropriate. He also mentioned that replacing the door would cost thousands of dollars and requested that the decision on the front door be tabled to allow time to collaborate with staff on a solution. The Board observed that the side door appears more historically accurate than the front door.

Additional comments addressed ADA compliance for the entrance and confirmed that the maximum allowable sign size is six square feet. The discussion concluded with consideration of other repairs and replacements required by the City.

Mr. Workley made a motion, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, to approve the sign with the following conditions: A maximum size of six feet, wood carved, no vinyl, and routed edges. Decisions regarding the doors to be continued to a future meeting. The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

B. [AHBR 2025-3633 E Streetsboro Street \(Historic District\)](#)

Accessory Structure (ADU)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by noting that AHBR approval was given at the May 14, 2025, AHBR meeting. The issue before the Board is that vinyl windows were used instead of the approved Pella Reserve series windows.

Ms. Tracy Crawford, homeowner, and Mr. Bob George, window supplier, were present for the meeting. Ms. Crawford stated that the approved windows were not available when the windows were installed. Mr. George also noted that the Anderson windows which were used are all wood and similar to the Pella windows.

The Board, staff, and applicant, reviewed Ms. Crawford pictures of the Anderson windows that she believes have an identical look to a Pella Reserve window. Mr. Caputo noted that the approved Pella windows have applied dividers. Mr. Sugar noted that vinyl is not a historical material and this window has not been approved in a past meeting. The Board did not speak favorably regarding the vinyl windows.

A motion was made by Ms. Marzulla, seconded by Ms. Kenney, that this AHBR Application be denied because: The approved windows were not used, and the windows that were used have vinyl cladding.. The Board also request staff to prepare Findings of Facts for the AHBR denial. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

C. [AHBR 25-1492](#) **6335 Elcrest Dr**

Addition (Living Room, Office, Bathroom, & Bedrooms)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by describing the project, noting that BZBA has approved a variance for the project, and detailing the revised elevations and staff comments.

Mr. Justin Englert, Tim Englert Construction, described the updated elevations and stated that the foundation line will match around the house, that a grading plan will be submitted with the final submittal, and that the roofing material above the door is to be decided.

The Board, applicant, and staff noted the existing windows will remain as is and that the posts will be 6 or 7 inches and evenly spaced on the porch.

Mr. Workley made a motion, seconded by Ms. Kenney, to approve noting the foundation block will match around the building, that the columns will be approximately 6 or 7 inches, and the roof will match the main mass. The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

VI. **New Business**

A. [AHBR 26-62](#) **37 E. Main Street (Historic District)**

Accessory Structure (Garage Expansion)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by, describing the project and noting the updated plans.

Ms. Bridget Tipton, architect, stated the purpose of the project is to allow two cars to park in the driveway, and described the work to be done as detailed in the plans. Ms. Tipton also described the new door as better matching the carriage style of the building.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed that the structure was built in 1961, that the plan is good, and that a pilaster can be added to the corner to help define the addition,

Mr. Workley made a motion, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, to approve the application while noting the shingles and corner boards are to match the existing and a pilaster will

be added at the pitch. The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

B. [AHBR 26-26](#) 5955 Nicholson Dr

Addition (Office, Changing Room & Covered Porch)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying the elevation, describing the project, and reviewing the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Robert Cogdeill, Roberts Construction, noted the lack of fenestration is partially mitigated by the bump out and noted if a window is required, a transom window will be most suitable, that the foundation materials will match the existing foundation, that trim will be applied - and the trim around the window will serve the dual purpose of trimming the door and a window, and that the existing shed will need to be removed for the project to move forward.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed the fenestration issue becoming less important with the existing deck, that it is impractical in a bathroom, and that the lack of grids on the new real windows will match the existing rear windows.

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Kenney, that this AHBR Application be approved as amended with the foundation matching the existing and the accessory building being removed. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

C. [AHBR 26-54](#) 1436 Plantation Dr

Addition (Master Bedroom, Bathroom and Laundry Room)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by describing the project and reviewing the staff comments and recommendations. Mr. Ryan McNutt of RT Design Solutions stated that he agreed with the staff comments and distributed his responses along with revisions to the drawings. He explained that the new plan includes stepping back the required 18 inches, adding new siding, adjusting window locations to meet the required fenestration widths, ensuring all siding will be horizontal, and making adjustments to the windows and doors within certain limitations.

The Board, the applicant, and staff confirmed that all siding will be the same color and that the foundation will match the existing structure.

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Kenney, that this AHBR application be approved as amended, with the updated drawings and the foundation to match the existing. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

D. [AHBR 26-69](#) 11 S Main Street (Gazebo Green - Historic District)

Alterations (Downtown Gazebo)

Ms. Jenna Stasik and Mr. Derek Kuryla of KGK explained that the proposal is City-sponsored and intended to make the central gathering place accessible to all while preserving its

historical integrity. Ms. Stasik presented two design options and emphasized the City's willingness to collaborate with the Hudson Heritage Association.

Mr. Kuryla stated that the redesign seeks to open all four sides of the gazebo for public use and performers and described the proposed ground plan. He also noted that reducing maintenance is a key objective of the project.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed the process for reviewing the two design options and the need to understand the existing gazebo and proposed changes. Ms. Stasik indicated that the City's preferred option is the more accessible design, while Mr. Kuryla explained that the lift alternative involves a ramp wrapping around the entire structure. Concerns raised included the popularity of the existing design, the desire for a site visit by Board members and the community, the frequent use of the Green (over 45 times per year), and the potential loss of charm with additional concrete. Other points included whether the design is appropriate for a historic structure in the district, the scale of modifications required for ADA compliance, the goal of maintaining openness in the public space, and whether music groups would prefer an elevated platform if it were large enough. The Board expressed concerns about losing historic integrity, requested elevations and site work details, noted that the circular design does not relate to the octagonal structure, and questioned whether the project feels rushed. Members stressed the significance of the gazebo as an important historic structure to the community.

Further discussion focused on the necessity of renovation and whether alternatives could preserve the gazebo's historic integrity. Ms. Stasik noted that many aspects of the structure are in poor condition, while the Board emphasized that the Historic District process prioritizes repair over replacement. Members agreed on the need for a site visit with the area staked out and requested a clear plan with elevations and materials for analysis. The Board also noted that they have not received complaints from musicians or the public regarding accessibility to the upper portion of the gazebo.

Staff confirmed that a site visit will be scheduled and that Board comments will be considered in preparing a revised proposal.

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

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

VII. Other Business

A. [AHBR 8495](#) 130 N Oviatt Street (Historic District)(Informal) Addition (Commercial)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application, noting that it involves a commercial addition and will require a major site plan review by the Planning Commission. She also reviewed staff comments and recommendations, emphasizing that the building is not subject to review under the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

Mr. Jason Boltz of Wheeler Boltz Architects and Mr. Jeff Jacko of WRA described the proposed addition as a two-story classroom space designed to help the existing building align

more closely with Western Reserve style architecture. The design aims to integrate the structure contextually with surrounding buildings, provide HVAC space in each room, correct existing entry issues, and ensure ADA compliance.

The Board, applicants, and staff discussed several points, including the presence of a well on the side of the building, the popularity and importance of Maker Space classes for students and recruitment, compliance of the windows with Department of the Interior guidelines, and the use of materials that will match surrounding structures. It was noted that the donor gift requires modern design elements for the innovation center. The Board encouraged WRA to consult with other schools that have implemented similar programs.

Further discussion focused on the visibility of the proposed structure from various vantage points on campus, its location, and how topography affects views of the addition. Renderings of the proposed work were reviewed, and the applicant's stated a "less is more" approach to the modern glass design will be followed. The Board also addressed the proposed 18-inch height increase above the existing building, which violates the LDC but is necessary for HVAC purposes; Board comments indicated this is unlikely to be a major issue. Finally, the Board expressed a desire for renderings showing the view from the President's house.

[AHBR 8493](#)

159 Hudson Street (Informal)

New House (Demolition and Single-Family Dwelling)

Ms. Coffman introduced the informal discussion for a new house and reviewed the staff comments. Mr. Brendan Boatwright, McAlpine House, architect and project manager, noted that the current house has a subtle tilt in relation to the street and displayed a rendering of the proposed structure. He explained that the design includes a garage positioned forward of the house, which the Board has not previously approved, and emphasized that the neighborhood features many prominent garages. He stated that true carriage house doors will be used and that efforts are being made to ensure the new house appears consistent with the character of the surrounding homes.

Mr. Boatwright acknowledged concerns about the size of the proposed house and that a setback of more than 10% might be requested. The Board noted that it may not fit the neighborhood and further indicated that, while the design is attractive, its scale may be too large for the lot and could require up to seven exceptions to the code, which the Board is generally not inclined to grant. Mr. Boatwright stated that a house designed to meet all code requirements might not be as beneficial for the neighborhood and requested that some exceptions be considered. The Board noted this will only be determined upon review of the final plan.

This matter was discussed

B.

[AHBR 8494](#)

22 Essex Rd (Informal)

Addition (Kitchen, Master Bedroom, Great Room, & Screened Porch)

Ms. Coffman introduced the informal review and staff comments.

Mr. Nate Bailey, Hara Architects, reviewed the renderings of the proposed house which is a type of Tutor style, explained why some of the recommendations are being made, noted on the front of the house all the windows will be replaced, a new siding will be applied to the

entire house, discussed the various roof lines, that brick will be matched to the extent possible, and noted brick will be the most prominent feature.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed: The use of brick around the window, the possibility of moving some of the rear windows to improved the large window proportions below, that the home does not have a water table, that the same style roof is being proposed as an existing roof, that two new roof shapes are being introduced, that there are existing hip roofs on the existing roof, that everything on the front of the house is existing, that the rear chimney height, as depicted on the elevation, need to be checked for correctness, that clipping the gable will not look appropriate, and that the entire roof will be replaced and new siding installed.

The Board did not have major objections to the proposed elevations.

This matter was discussed

D. [AHBR 25-1375](#) Architectural and Historic Board of Review Findings of Fact for case #25-1375, Findings of Fact for the property at 7542 Darrow Road.

Ms. Coffman introduced the official Findings of Facts, as prepared by staff.

A motion was made by Ms. Sredinski, seconded by Mr. Workley, that the Findings of Facts as presented be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Abstain: 1 - Ms. Kenney

E. [AHBR 1.28.2026](#) Minutes of Previous Architectural & Historic Board of Review Meeting: January 28, 2026.

A motion was made by Ms. Kenney, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, that this Minutes approval be postponed to 2/25/2026. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

VIII. Staff Update

There were no staff updates.

IX. Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Marzulla, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, that the meeting be adjourned at 10:35 pm. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski, Mr. Brown 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.

* * *