



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Draft 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, September 25, 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. Marzulla, Mr. Ray, Mr. Wetzel, Mr. Workley and Ms. Sredinski

Absent: 1 - Ms. Kenney

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. Marzulla, to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

A. [AHBR 24-1042](#) 7335 Hudson Park Dr

Addition (Family Room)

Attachments: [7335 Hudson Park Dr AHBR Packet](#)

This matter was approved on the Consent Agenda.

B. [AHBR 24-975](#) 6760 Pheasants Ridge

Accessory structure

Attachments: [6760 Pheasants Ridge AHBR Packet](#)

This matter was approved on the Consent Agenda.

V. Old Business

There was no Old Business.

VI. New Business**A. [AHBR 24-1051](#) 1931 Barlow Rd**

Ground Sign

Attachments: [1931 Barlow Rd AHBR Packet](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the sign placement, describing the project, and reviewing the staff comments.

Mr. Joe Creehan, Case Barlow Farm, was present for the meeting.

The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed: That the changeable words on the removable portion of the sign will be in the same font as the main sign and made out of metal, that the stone pillars were donated, that the concrete base will be in the ground, that the fence will be moved back, and that the sign is a composite material.

A motion was made by Mr. Ray, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, that this AHBR Application be approved as amended so that the letters have a matte finish. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

B. [AHBR 24-1043](#) 33 Roslyn Ave (Historic District)

Fence (3-foot & 6-foot gate)

Attachments: [33 Roslyn AHBR Packet](#)

The applicant was not present for the meeting.

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying and describing the revised project with a newly installed wood gate and existing chain link fence.

The Board continued the application to the October meeting.

This matter was continued.

C. [AHBR 24-1013](#) **148 Elm St (Historic District)**
[Resubmittal](#) Resubmittal for Vinyl Siding (Pergola)

Attachments: [148 Elm St - AHBR Packet](#)
[Additional Documentation](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by noting the application was approved by AHBR on September 11, 2024, following the approval the applicant requested a reconsideration of the materials because of cost. Staff subsequently visited the site and confirmed that all existing structures are vinyl sided and the code allows a new structure to be vinyl, if it matches the existing structures materials, and the proposed structure is in the rear yard.

Ms. Lydia Wolf, homeowner, was present for the meeting.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed the wood being \$2000 more expensive than vinyl and that Azek is not an option given by the builder of the pergola - which will be constructed on site, and that wood columns covered by vinyl is the proposed construction.

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Mr. Ray, that this AHBR Application be approved since the vinyl will match the other structures on the property and the metal on the pergola roof will match the house windows. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

D. [AHBR 24-859](#) **102 Ravenna St**
Detached accessory structure

Attachments: [102 Ravenna St AHBR Packet](#)

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

Mr. Stephen Noffsinger, property owner, noted that the proposed project is behind a pool house which has both singles and metal on the roof and is not viewable from the road, and that double hung windows are being proposed which mimic the house.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed: The use of metal on the roof, the type and size of windows on the house, and that the grids should match the grids on the house.

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, that this AHBR Application be approved as amended with a metal roof to match the pool house, and double hung window with grids to match the house window grids. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

F. [AHBR 24-1039](#) 5 Baldwin St (Historic District)

Addition, Alterations (Mud Room, Siding, Patio)

Attachments:

[5 Baldwin St AHBR Packet](#)

[5 Baldwin St AHBR Packet 9.25.14](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying and describing the project, and reviewing the staff comments with a recommendation that a site visit be conducted.

Ms. Madelyn Midgley, and Mr. Joseph Matava, Peninsula Architects, noted the historic character of this recently purchased house and the owners desire to restore the house. Ms. Midgley described the proposed work on the house.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed: If the shutters will be functional, the type of details on the proposed porch, that all the siding on the east elevation is to be replaced, and that a site visit will be conducted.

This matter was continued.

**G. [AHBR 20-875](#) 36 S Main Street (Yours Truly)
[Rooftop](#)
[Screening](#)**

Rooftop Screening

Attachments:

[Packet For AHBR](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the building and noting that a condition of the previous approval was screening be installed on the roof.

Mr. Lee Blake, Yours Truly, noted that the fence could be lowered to 36 inches which will cover the tallest part of the roof equipment, that a matte finish will be used, that photos of this fence from the fabricator do not exist, that if the screen is moved next to the railing it would raise the height to 50 inches, and that the screen could be moved approximately two feet over.

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, that this AHBR application be approved as amended with: A black matte finish, the screen be 36 inches high, and it be moved over to approximately 3 or 4 inches from the roof railing system. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

H. [AHBR 24-1056](#) 230 N. Main Street (Historic District)

Alterations

Attachments: [230 N Main AHBR Packet](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by: Displaying and describing the project, noting work has been done on the building and a stop work order is in place, that in 2009 unapproved work was done on the house, and recently rotten wood siding was removed (as seen by staff), and displayed the specification sheets for the proposed materials,

Mr. Rex Morrison, and Ms. Kayrl Morrison, described the proposed roof materials and the benefits of these materials.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed the use of synthetic slate in Hudson, the purpose of the 5-foot tall shadow fence in the back of the house being to screen the property, that the back fence does not match other fences on the property, that the current windows are probably a third generation of replacement, and the fencing styles around the property.

Mr. Workley made a motion, seconded by Mr. Ray, to approve the items which have been installed and to direct the applicant to submit an application for any additional work. The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

I. [AHBR 22-294](#) **56 College Street (Historic District)**
[Remanded](#) Alterations

Attachments:

[Signed BZBA Decision](#)

[Previous Meeting Minutes and Agenda](#)

[56 College St. AHBR Packet 6.12.24 Meeting](#)

[56 College Street AHBR Packet 5.22.24 Meeting](#)

[56 College Street Previously Approved Plans](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the elevations, noting that the application was approved at the June 26, 2024, AHBR meeting, and that following that meeting the AHBR decision was appealed by BZBA where the AHBR decision was vacated. The issue is now before AHBR again. Since the BZBA decision discussion has taken place with further analysis presented to the Board.

Mr. Chris Lachman, project manager, and Mr. Tony Vacanti, attorney representing the property owner, noted the homeowner was doing extensive work on the property prior to the stop work order. Mr. Vacanti presented four items and the rationale for the Board's consideration: 1) The siding. 2) The circular window. 3) The installation of Pella Reserve Windows. 4) The skylight and its visibility. Mr. Vacanti then walked the Board through a folder with additional information. The Board and applicant discussed replacing the circular window with a Pella Reserve window, why the applicant believes the proposed project is consistent with the neighborhood and Historic District, and the need for the old windows to be replaced.

Mr. Lachman, described the project to date, the look and character of the skylight, the visibility of the skylight, that the relocation of the circular window will be somewhat covered by the sun porch addition and will be difficult to see from the street, that the proposed windows to be replaced are in poor condition, that the look of the Pella windows is slightly different from the original windows, and the proposed Pella windows have been used throughout the Historic District.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed: The reason for keeping the circular window is the owners like of the window and that it makes it her home. The Board discussed: That some of the examples of round windows are not applicable to the exterior of a house, that the regulations require new windows match this historic look and character of the historic windows, that skylights in the Historic District are legacy skylights, that the requested circular window will be part of a wall fenestration, the visibility or lack of visibility of the circular window, the elevated skylight not being in keeping with other skylights which are flat, the diminishment of the historic aspect of the home with the use of the skylight, the comparison with another local house where a site visit was conducted which showed the need for a major renovation, that three of the windows do need to be replaced, that the skylight seems out of place on this house, and the possibility of moving the skylight to the northerly portion of the house where it will be for all intents out of site.

Mr. Brown, architect, noted the clearest view of the circular window shows only a five-inch view of the metal, and that the back part of the house is an addition - making it more suitable for the circular window. The Board noted adding non historical elements to a non historical addition does not help the situation.

The Board discussed the window replacements of the deteriorated windows on the north and south elevations, the siding replacements, the two skylights which are different shapes and must be approved separately, and the circular window being used.

Mr. Vacanti noted the Board members personal feelings should have no weight in the decisions; the decision should be if the character of the home from the public realm is changed. He also stated his opinion that since the work is on a non historic portion of the house which is not visible from the street it is out of the purview of this Board, and asked if moving the skylight to the sunroom where it is not visible from the public realm would change the Board's opinion - the Board discussed moving the skylight to the roof of the sunroom.

Mr. Sugar noted the Board has the right to continue the case and request the preservation consultant review the circular window. The applicants requested the historic consultant do the review and they be present.

The applicant withdrew their request to have the historic consultant review the use of the circular window. Discussion took place regarding the historic consultant and the use of a findings-of-fact.

Mr. Vacanti objected to the use of finding of facts when it is the Board's responsibility under 2506 of the ORC to render decisions, not use someone outside the context of the hearings who cannot be questioned by the applicant. Chair Caputo noted the Board is permitted to delay the meeting to gather further information. Mr. Vacanti stated he disagrees with Chair Caputo's opinion.

Discussion took place regarding which items the Board informally agreed to and if items may be voted on separately.

Mr. Sugar recommended the Board continue the application to the October 9, 2024 meeting, while noting the window replacement, skylight, and siding replacement received informal approval from the Board and recommended the Board request a review by the preservation consultant regarding moving the circular window to the sunroom.

The Board discussed voting on the application without including the circular window which may have a separate application for the October 9, 2024 meeting, and the removal of the Stop Work order.

Mr. Workley made a motion, seconded by Mr. Wetzel, to approve: The north skylight, the window replacements on the north and south sides, the proposed south skylight if it is relocated to the northern sunroom addition, and the siding replacement. These items were included in the staff memo and applicant's testimony.

The motion also includes the proposed circular window and its relocation to the rear of the house shall be filed under a separate application to be heard at the October 9, 2024 meeting, and requested the City's preservation consultant conduct a site visit and submit a report.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

VII. Other Business

A. [AHBR 8-28-24](#) **Minutes of Previous Architectural & Historic Board of Review Meeting:
August 28, 2024.**

Attachments: [August 28 AHBR Meeting Minutes - DRAFT](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Wetzel, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, that the August 28, 2024, Minutes be approved as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

B. [AHBR 9.11.2024](#) **Minutes of Previous Architectural & Historic Board of Review Meeting:
September 11, 2024.**

Attachments: [September 11, 2024 AHBR Minutes](#)

A motion was made by Ms. Sredinski, seconded by Mr. Workley, that the September 11, 2024, Minutes be approved as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

VIII. Staff Update

Mr. Sugar noted the Comprehensive Plan is due for its third reading before Council and will be presented to the AHBR during the winter months.

This matter was discussed

IX. Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Marzulla, seconded by Mr. Wetzel, that the meeting be adjourned at 9:59 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.

* * *