



# City of Hudson, Ohio

## Meeting Minutes - Final Architectural & Historic Board of Review

*John Caputo, Chair*  
*Allyn Marzulla, Vice Chair*  
*John Workley, Secretary*  
*Françoise Massardier-Kenney*  
*William Ray*  
*Jamie Sredinski*  
*Karl Wetzel*

*Nicholas Sugar, City Planner*  
*Amanda Krickovich, Associate Planner*

---

Wednesday, November 13, 2024

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. Ray, Mr. Workley and Ms. Sredinski

**Absent:** 1 - Mr. Wetzel

### III. Public Comment

Chair Caputo opened the meeting to public comments for anyone wanting to address the Board.

Ms. Tracy Crawford, 6554 Elmcrest Drive, discussed the house at 13 N. Oviatt Street and its probable build date of the late 1960s. Ms. Crawford also displayed historical photos which support her build date and described historic tax records with incorrect build dates for numerous structures. A letter stating there is no proof of the build date was submitted from Summit County.

Ms. Candace Sveda, noted the house at 13 N. Oviatt, when last purchased was not included in the Historic District, that today the 795 square foot house has no insulation tree root problems under the slab. Ms. Sveda encouraged the Board allow the demolition of the house.

Mr. Rob Swedenborg, 200 Laurel Lake Drive, noted after researching the house at 13 N. Oviatt he has three conclusions: 1) There is no historical significance to the house because: . The interior was gutted and rebuild in 1970, the exterior uses vinyl, the type of windows, and the workmanship. 2) There is no reliable build date and the tax records of build are inconclusive to the applicant. 3) The Board is not to be blinded by the historic preservation goals at the cost of the greater good, which will be a new house to improve the streetscape.

Mr. George Roth, former owner of 105 E. Streetsboro Street - which at one time included 13 N. Oviatt property, noted that just because 13 N. Oviatt is old, does not make it historical, and it does not have historical value. Mr. Roth also stated the house is in extremely poor condition and encouraged the Board to allow the demolition.

### 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:** 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray, Mr. Workley and Ms. Sredinski

**A. [AHBR 24-1215](#) 168 Hudson Street (Historic District)**

Fence (6' wood extension)

**Attachments:** [168 Hudson St. AHBR Packet](#)

**This AHBR application was approved on the Consent Agenda.**

**B. [AHBR 24-1227](#) 136 Hudson Street (Historic District)**

Alteration (Roof Replacement)

**Attachments:** [136 Hudson St. AHBR Packet](#)

**This AHBR application was approved on the Consent Agenda.**

C. [AHBR 24-1183](#) **83 W. Case Drive**

Addition (Sunroom)

Attachments: [83 W. Case Dr. AHBR Packet](#)

**This AHBR application was approved on the Consent Agenda.**

V. **Old Business**

A. [AHBR 24-1098](#) **56 College Street (Historic District)**

Alteration (Circular art glass window)

Attachments: [56 College Street AHBR Packet](#)  
[Consultant Recommendation](#)

Ms. Kenney recused herself from this hearing due to a conflict of interest.

Ms. Krickovich introduced the application by displaying and describing the elevations, noting the Board's concerns, the historic consultant's recommendations, and the revisions to the application.

Mr. Tony Vicanti, attorney for the applicant, and the Board discussed the approvals at the previous AHBR meeting, that the circular window is the singular item to be discussed at this meeting, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards which are to be applied in a reasonable manner, other standards which this project meets, that the circular new art glass window will be repositioned from the original north elevation to the 1980 addition of the north elevation and will not be visible from the public right-of-way, and his opinion that the Board should grant the application.

Mr. Chris Lachman, CSO Consulting, noted the window will be located outside the public view, in a non historic portion of the house, and the work was given approval to proceed by Mr. Sugar.

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

**Aye:** 5 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray, Mr. Workley and Ms. Sredinski

**Recused:** 1 - Ms. Kenney

**B. [AHBR 24-998](#) 48 College Street (Historic District)  
Alteration & Addition**

**Attachments:**     [48 College St. AHBR Packet 11.13 Meeting](#)  
                              [48 College St. Consultant Report](#)  
                              [48 N. Oviatt AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Krickovich introduced the application by displaying photos and elevations of the house in question, noting a site visit took place on October 23, 2024, and the historic consultants recommendations.

Ms. Elizabeth Nicklas, and Mr. Joe Matava, Peninsula Architects, recapped and described the project, reviewed the changes to the application and fenestration placement, and noted that historically appropriate wood doors will be used.

The Board, applicant and staff discussed: The visual impact of the large doors, that the side with the doors cannot be seen from any street view, the historic consultants recommendation to leave the door in the center of the structure - which does not meet the need of the homeowner, that the trellis will be restored and replaced, the short walkway to the garage, the Board's discomfort with moving doors and windows just to meet the needs of the homeowner, that currently the neighbors view a poorly disorganized and not maintained garden that does not have much activity, that the recommendation to double the number of windows and keep the door means a lot of windows and makes the interior design difficult, that Peninsula Architects believes bringing light into an old house is a positive movement, that these plans do not preserve a large portion of the facade, that if the entirety of the house is considered the changes are minor, but if only the facade is considered these are large changes, the possibility of using two sets of double doors, other possibilities for toning down the plan so that less of the facade is changed, and the architect argued that it is the private side of the house.

Ms. Nicklas requested partial approvals of the application, which will not include the doors.

**Ms. Kenney made a motion, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, to approve the connector because the exception has been approved by BZB,A, it is not in public view, and is an existing garage. The motion was approved by the following vote:**

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

C. [AHBR 24-426](#) **13 N. Oviatt Street (Historic District)**  
Demolition (One Story, Single-Family House)

**Attachments:**     [13 N. Oviatt New Documents for 12.11 Meeting](#)  
                              [13 N. Oviatt AHBR Packet 11.13 Meeting](#)  
                              [Perspectus Consultant Report](#)  
                              [13 N. Oviatt AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Krickovich introduced the application by noting the history of the application, the attached historic consultants report and a recommendation to deny the application to demolish.

Mr. Clayton Braham, and Ms. Candace Sveda, stated the build date the consultant is using may not be accurate as shown by the many wrong dates presented earlier in the meeting and the submitted photograph shows the house was not in place at the date given by the consultant. Mr. Braham also stated the house was incorporated into the historic district after its purchase, that qualified people have stated the historic date is not correct, that significant changes have already taken place to the house - prior to being in the historic district, that the house does not fit the quality of the neighborhood, that there is little of original structure remaining today that is of historic value, that the house might have been a shed when built, that the original house did not have a kitchen, that particle board is used on the gable ends with two-by-two as part of the framing, and that the lack of historic material in the house will help in not setting precedent.

The Board noted the dating errors found were all before 1900, that the photo does not conclusively show the house not in place prior to 1963, that Ohio Soil and Aerial Department pictures were not included in any presentation, the problem of setting precedent for demolishing houses, that there is little historic value in the house, and that a site visit will be appropriate in light of this being a demolition of a house of unknown date.

The Board suggested that staff write the motion so the reasons for allowing the demolition are clear.

**A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Mr. Ray, to conduct a site visit to examine the materials. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

## VI. New Business

A. [AHBR 24-1224](#) **94 First Street (The Spice & Tea Exchange)**  
Sign (Wall & Projecting)

**Attachments:**     [94 First St. AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Krickovich introduced the application by displaying revised renderings of the sign on the building and reviewing the staff comments.

Ms. Marie Cipolletta, Signarama, stated the lettering in the font is not able to be dimensional and the business owner would like to use this font.

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

**Aye:** 5 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Mr. Ray, Mr. Workley and Ms. Sredinski

**Nay:** 1 - Ms. Marzulla

**B. [AHBR 24-1069](#) 341 Aurora Street**

Fence (4' & 6' Vinyl)

**Attachments:** [341 Aurora AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Krickovich introduced the application by displaying the site and describing the project design and reviewing the staff comments.

Ms. Vicki Marshall, resident, was present for the meeting.

The Board, applicant and staff discussed the design of the fence, if the entire fence could be six-feet high, that the fence must be behind the main mass of the structure it is near, that the house is approximately 600-feet from the street, that a step design is not needed for this location, and the purpose of the fence is to keep deer out.

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

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

**C. [AHBR 24-1236](#) 95 E. Streetsboro (Historic District)**

Alteration (Windows)

**Attachments:** [95 E. Streetsboro Packet](#)

Ms. Krickovich introduced the application by displaying the elevations, reviewing the Secretary of the Interior's standards, displaying photos of the windows to be replaced, and reviewing the staff comments.

Mr. Greg Chaplin, architect, was present for the meeting.

The Board, applicant, and staff, noted that normally a site visit is conducted when windows are to be replaced, however since good photos were submitted which show the poor condition of the existing windows, and this is a third floor project, the site visit is not needed.

**A motion was made by Mr. Workley seconded by Mr. Ray, that this AHBR Application be approved with the existing trim around the windows and placement inset be maintained. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

**D. [AHBR 24-1219](#) 172 Aurora Street (Historic District)**

Alteration (Porch Re-build)

**Attachments:**     [172 Aurora AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Krickovich introduced the application by displaying the elevations, explaining the project and materials, and reviewing the staff comments.

Mr. Dave Morehead, homeowner, stated the project is being done because of sewer issues and the front steps will be rebuilt with the same materials as existing and in the same design.

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

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

**E. [AHBR 24-1211](#) 2275 Danbury Lane**

Addition (Dining Room & Kitchen)

**Attachments:**     [2275 Danbury AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Krickovich introduced the application by displaying and explaining the elevations and reviewing the staff comments.

Mr. Nate Bailey, Hara Architects, noted the roofing can be made to match in pitch and materials, that the proposed shed roof is to accommodate second floor windows, that the addition roofline will be above the existing roofline, that casement windows are preferred since there are no neighbors in the rear to see them, and that the head heights of the doors and windows are in alignment except for the window above the sink.

**Ms. Marzulla moved to approve, seconded by Mr. Ray, with the overhanging roof having asphalt shingles. The motion was approved by the following vote:**

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

**F. [AHBR 24-1210](#) 6543 Elmcrest Drive**

Addition (Attached Garage)

**Attachments:**     [6543 Elmcrest AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Krickovich introduced the application by displaying and describing the project including the revised drawing, and reviewing the staff comments.

Mr. Nate Bailey, Hara Architects, and Mr. Charles Walton, homeowner, described: The additional fenestration and why fenestration was not added to the master bedroom, the possibility of moving the bathroom window over approximately two-feet to lessen the fenestration issue, that the full width of a column be used against the house to support the material change, and that the standing seam material is being used because of the aesthetics of the material and it will be invisible from the street. With regard to the height of the wings Mr. Bailey noted this is a detached garage, the existing house is one story, and he displayed renderings that show the garage from many angles cannot be seen above the house, and presented documents showing the neighbors support the project.

The Board, Mr. Bailey, and staff discussed: Mr. Bailey's responses to the staff comments, that moving the bathroom windows will reduce the fenestration gap to 14-feet, that a window can be added to the north elevation, that the roof will be resingled, that there will not be a living space above the garage, that the addition height is appropriate considering the house is one story, the distance of the house from the street, the possibility of the porch and roof being one pitch, and that the valley created by the two rooflines is not permitted.

Mr. Bailey requested the application be approved, aside from the roofline, which could be approved by staff.

**Ms. Kenney made a motion, seconded by Mr. Ray, for a partial approval of the application with the following conditions and findings: A window be added on the north elevation, columns be placed against the house at the front entrance material change, that the transition from the shingle to metal roofs are complementary, and an exception to the addition height requirement is given because of the separation between the house and garage, the single story house has a low height, the structure is 100-feet from the road, and the siteline makes the addition not visible. Ms. Kenney also moved that an administrative review be conducted to approve the rooflines. The motion was approved by the following vote:**

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



**G. [AHBR 24-1194](#) 5259 Preserve Lane**

New Residential Construction (Two-story single-family dwelling)

**Attachments:** [5259 Preserve Ln. AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Krickovich introduced the application by displaying the site plan, describing the project, and reviewing the staff comments.

Mr. Tony Lunardi, LDA Builders, the Board, and staff, discussed if the wing is moved back one foot it would become a projection which is allowed, that the chimney will be covered with stone veneer, how the windows can be reconfigured with transoms to allow 18-inches on each side instead of being pinned against the corners, the windows be moved toward the middle, and that a 4-foot dormer be added to the 60-foot wall span over the double hung window.

**Mr. Workley made a motion, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, to approve with the following conditions: The projection be moved back one foot, that stone be added to the chimney to match the foundation, that twin double hung windows with transoms above be added to the back elevation, a the side window on the back be moved inward, and a 4-foot transom be added to the 60-foot wall span. The motion was approved by the following vote:**

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

**VII. Other Business****A. [AHBR 24-1244](#) 333 Aurora Street (Informal)**

Addition (Attached Garage)

**Attachments:** [333 Aurora AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Krickovich introduced the application by displaying the site plan and reviewing the staff comments including that the house is set back about 200-feet and front facing garages are permitted if over 100-feet from the road, which this is.

Mr. Joseph Franzese, architect, and Lauren, homeowner, were present for the meeting.

Mr. Franzese, noted the addition is both smaller and lower and behind the existing house, with the existing house with porch being 2100 square feet and the addition being 1940 square feet, however, the LDC does not allow the porch to be included.

The Board and applicant, and staff, discussed: Making this two additions instead of just one - which might be permitted, what is the actual new portion of the addition, that anything which is torn down and rebuilt - is considered new addition, that the addition does not seem out of proportion, that the neighboring houses are large, and the applicant should consider what exceptions the Board might consider if the application is granted.

**This matter was discussed.**

**B. [AHBR 2025](#) 2025 Architectural & Historic Board of Review Meeting Schedule**

**Attachments:** [2025 AHBR Meeting Schedule - Draft](#)

**A motion was made by Ms. Kenney, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, that the 2025 meeting schedule be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

**C. [AHBR 7572](#) Minutes of Previous Architectural & Historic Board of Review Meeting: October 23, 2024.**

**Attachments:** [October 23, 2024 AHBR Minutes - Draft](#)

**A motion was made by Ms. Marzulla, seconded by Ms. Kenney, that the October 23, 2023, Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

**VIII. Staff Update**

Chair Caputo notified the Board that Mr. Wetzel has resigned from the Board.

**A. [AHBR 7569](#) AHBR Workshop Discussion**

**Attachments:** [AHBR Workshop Memo](#)

Ms. Krickovich notified the Board that Tuesday, December 3, 2024, will be the AHBR workshop.

**IX. Adjournment**

**A motion was made by Ms. Marzulla, seconded by Mr. Workley, that the meeting be adjourned at 10:38 p.m. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

---

**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.*

\* \* \*