



# City of Hudson, Ohio

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

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

*Nicholas Sugar, City Planner*  
*Lauren Coffman, Associate Planner*

---

Wednesday, July 23, 2025

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

**Absent:** 1 - Ms. Manko

### III. Public Comment

Chair Caputo opened the meeting to public comments for anyone wanting to address the Board. There were no comments.

### IV. Consent Applications

**A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

- A. [AHBR 25-802](#) **90 Aurora Street (Historic District)**  
Roof (Shingle & EPDM Replacement)  
This AHBR agenda item was approved on the Consent Agenda.
- B. [AHBR 25-861](#) **1991 Hines Hill Rd**  
Accessory Structure (Detached Garage)  
This AHBR agenda item was approved on the Consent Agenda.
- C. [AHBR 25-774](#) **2113 Ravenna St (Gloria Dei Lutheran Church)**  
Accessory Structure (Commercial Pavilion)

This AHBR agenda item was approved on the Consent Agenda.

## V. Old Business

There was no Old Business.

## VI. New Business

### A. [AHBR 25-684](#) **2712 Hudson Aurora Rd**

#### Alterations (Window Replacement)

Mr. Sugar introduced the project by describing and displaying the work, and noting the applicant wants to have a picture window in place of the typical window.

Mr. Zachary Barron, Renewal By Anderson, was present for the meeting.

The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed: The misunderstanding if the proposed windows are part of a basement or lower level of the house. The Board determined they were part of a lower level first floor and the replacement windows should match the typical house windows, with the same style and grid patterns.

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

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

### B. [AHBR 2025-255](#) **5876 Darrow Rd**

#### Sign (Ground Sign)

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

Mr. David Soulsby, sign company owner, distributed and reviewed the revised plans for the Board. Mr. Soulsby noted it is a double sided, double lighted sign, which is lower than the previously proposed sign.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed two options, one with, and one without the side supports, the possibility of reducing the depth of the sign, the inclusion of the address of the building, and that a matte finish will be used.

**A motion was made by Ms. Kenney, seconded by Mr. Workley, that this AHBR Application be approved as amended, with design option one, a matte finish, plantings, and the address on the east side, as approved by staff. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

### C. [AHBR 25-762](#)

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

Mr. Kevin Holiday, A Sign Above, displayed and described the material that will be used to construct the sign, noted the color of the brick will be matched, that the outside corners will be mitered, that no lighting will be installed with the sign, that, as far as is known, the only brick on the building is the chimney, the size of the sign and base, that other similar height

signs are on South Oviatt Street, that this type of material is new to the AHBR, the Board's concern regarding the use of the panel without seeing the details, that the base of the sign is too large in relation to the top of the sign, the foundation type, that mulch may be put around the panel, and the Board's desire to see a finished corner.

The Board requested more information regarding the corners of the sign and the finish detail, the framing / foundation plan, that a masonry base should be used, and that the applicant needs to provide greater detail to the Board. The applicant and Board discussed if the sign would be approved as is, if real brick were used.

Discussion also took place regarding other signs in the complex.

**A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Kenney, that this AHBR Application be approved as amended, with a brick or face brick foundation, which is lowered 4 inches from the current design, and a landscaping plan be submitted to staff. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

**D.      [AHBR 25-741](#) 136 Sunset Dr  
Fence (5ft Wood)**

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying a photo of the house and property, describing the project, and reviewing the staff comments, and applicable LDC requirements.

Mr. David Rohan, father of the applicant, noted the intention of the homeowners was not drawn well on the submitted plans, the purpose of the fence is to keep their dog in the yard. The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed: The height being 5 feet, that staff has seen split rail fence in the backyard with a mesh, that this project only uses mesh in the rear yard, the complication of approving mesh 5 feet high, that the proposed mesh is only to contain a dog to the yard, the recommendation that a board be along the bottom, the possibility of only having the mesh portion of the fence be about 3 feet high, and that the proposed fence is PVC coated metal mesh.

The Board discussed the height of the fence, that mesh is being used when possibly not allowed by the LDC, and that a split rail fence of lower height with mesh might be allowed.

The applicant requested the application be continued.

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

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

**E.      [AHBR 25-717](#) 750 W Streetsboro St  
Accessory Structure (Outdoor Restroom Facility)**

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying the site plan and describing the outdoor restroom project.

Mr. Eric Solf, SoL Harris/Day Architecture, and Mr. Jimmy Kozy, Christ Community Chapel, described the project, and responded to the lack of fenestration issue by distributing revised plans with a faux window.

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

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

## **VII. Other Business**

Ms. Marzulla stated appreciation for the newsletter with information regarding permits for projects.

**This matter was discussed**

## **VIII. Staff Update**

Ms. Coffman requested AHBR members have a second subcommittee meeting for the Historic Landmark Project.

## **IX. Adjournment**

**A motion was made by Ms. Marzulla, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, that the meeting be adjourned at 8:51 p.m.. The motion carried by an unanimous vote.**

---

**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.*

\* \* \*