



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, January 28, 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: 5 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 2 - Ms. Kenney and 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

Since Mr. Sugar stated that the applicants for Agenda items B, C, and E, would not be in attendance at the meeting; a motion was made by Ms. Sredinski, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, that Agenda items, B, C, and E, be moved to the end of the agenda.. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Ms. Kenney and Ms. Manko

Consent Applications

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

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

Absent: 2 - Ms. Kenney and Ms. Manko

- A. [AHBR 25-1471](#) **229 N Hayden Pkwy**
Addition (3 Seasons Room)
Attachments: [229 N Hayden Pkwy - AHBR Packet](#)
- This AHBR application was approved on the Consent Agenda.

V. Old Business

- B. [AHBR 25-1375](#) **7542 Darrow Rd**
Sign (Ground Sign)
Attachments: [7542 Darrow Rd - AHBR Packet](#)
- Mr. Sugar introduced the application by noting this sign was installed without a permit and since it has been on the agenda for several months.
- The Board noted two major issues: The sign has a gloss finish, and no trim. Either of these issues could qualify to deny the application. The Board also noted the applicant was on the agenda and has not been able to attend multiple AHBR meetings.
- Mr. Workley made a motion, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, to deny the application, and request Staff develop written Findings of Fact to be presented to the AHBR at the next meeting for approval. The denial is based on the Architectural Design Standard, V-5. Mr. Workley also noted that AHBR does not grant an exception based on an Exceptional Design, or that Unique Conditions exist that create a practical difficulty. The motion was approved by the following vote:**

- C. [AHBR 26-1](#) **516 W Streetsboro Street**
Sign (Ground and Building) Deeper Life Bible Church
Attachments: [516 W Streetsboro St - AHBR Packet 3.11.2026](#)
[516 Streetsboro St - AHBR Packet](#)
- Mr. Sugar introduced the application by noting that updates have been submitted.
- The applicant was not present due to sickness.
- The Board discussed this as a better rendering than the previous sign. The Board expressed a desire to see the profile from the street and questioned if there will be a gap between the two faces of the sign. The Board also stated a desire for less text on the sign and other ways to make it more appropriate.
- Regarding the sign on the church, the Board felt the upper outside corners were questionable.
- A motion was made by Ms. Marzulla, seconded by Mr. Brown, that this AHBR Application be continued. The motion carried by the following vote:**
- Aye:** 5 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown
- Absent:** 2 - Ms. Kenney and Ms. Manko

- D. [AHBR 25-1343](#) **95 Maple Drive (Historic District)**
[\(1.28.26 meeting\)](#) Alterations (Window, Door Replacement, and Rear Deck)

Attachments: [95 Maple Drive - Updated documents 1.21.2026](#)
 [95 Maple Sr - AHBR Packet from 12.10.25](#)

Mr. Sugar began the discussion by presenting the application and displaying the elevations. He explained that further research revealed the house is part of the local Historic District, which was established in 1991, but not the National Historic District. This explains why some of the historic forms were not completed. He noted that the current siding was previously approved as acceptable material and that there are no approval records for the windows.

Ms. Juliann Nathanson stated that three windows and four doors were replaced prior to receiving the Stop Work order. She has since submitted photographs showing that the new doors match the previous ones, along with a signed and notarized statement detailing the materials that were removed. She emphasized that the new doors and materials were installed on a like-for-like basis. Additional work remains unfinished due to the Stop Work order, including the installation of trim, which she assured will match what was removed. Ms. Nathanson also pointed out that the house currently has twelve vinyl windows, making bullet point “d” of the staff report questionable, as the windows that were replaced were also vinyl.

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed several points. They agreed that if the house were not part of the Historic District, the newer materials would have been permitted. No records exist to indicate what materials were on the house prior to its inclusion in the district, and historically, the Board has not required homeowners to upgrade materials that were approved before incorporation. It was noted that the wood windows on the west side will either be replaced with wood-clad windows or restored if possible. Many siding pieces need to be replaced with matching materials, and the existing cellar door requires refinishing and proper trim. Some windows will need to be removed and reset for correct installation. The vinyl siding was installed properly under an existing permit, and the current wood casement windows are not original to the house. The Board expressed that consistent windows throughout the property are desirable.

Regarding the deck, the applicant proposed a metal railing; however, the Board recommended using wood posts with wood top and bottom rails as a more appropriate option.

Mr. Workley moved to approve the application with specific conditions, and the motion was seconded by Ms. Sredinski. The conditions included the following: all windows must be Anderson wood-clad aluminum; the west elevation shall feature double-hung windows consistent with the rest of the house; deck posts and upper and lower rails must be constructed of wood; any siding repairs must be blended in accordance with Section III.G.11; all submittals must be updated to reflect the Board’s comments; and all trim must match the existing trim. The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Ms. Kenney and Ms. Manko

VI. New Business

E. [AHBR 25-1478](#) **88 N Main Street (Historic District)**
 Alterations (Hanging sign & door replacements)

Attachments: [88 N Main St - AHBR Packet](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by noting the applicant is unable to attend the meeting and stated the hanging sign would be wood instead of PVC, that he would discuss the front door with the owner so it would be less modern looking, and recommended the Board table the application.

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. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 2 - Ms. Kenney and Ms. Manko

**F. [AHBR 26-6](#) 7545 Darrow Rd
Fence (Chain Link) - Hudson Montessori School**

Attachments: [7545 Darrow Rd - AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Coffman began the discussion by introducing the application, displaying the site plan, and reviewing staff comments. She noted that chain-link fencing is not a permitted material under the Land Development Code (LDC). Mr. Devan Yanc and Mr. Matt Virgle, representing Hudson Montessori Schools, attended the meeting to present their case. Chair Caputo emphasized that the Architectural and Historic Board of Review (AHBR) does not approve chain-link fencing except when requested to do so by the Fire Marshal.

The Board discussed several points, including when chain-link fencing became a non-permitted material, the large amount of fencing requested, and the fact that approximately 764 feet of the proposed fence would be located in wooded areas and largely unseen, while only 74 feet would be visible on the north side. On the south side of the property, multiple fencing materials are already present. Mr. Yanc explained that the school received a security fence grant, which does not cover alternative fencing materials. He stated that other fencing options were considered but are not financially feasible. He also noted that the existing split-rail fence is in poor condition and visually unappealing. Additionally, he pointed out that Hudson Country Club, located on the east side of the property, has a 14-foot-high chain-link fence.

Mr. Surar suggested that a post-and-rail fence with wire fencing on the inside might be acceptable to the granting authority and noted that AHBR has previously approved split-rail fencing with interior wire. The Board concluded by discussing its lack of authority to approve a fence that is not permitted by the LDC.

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

Absent: 2 - Ms. Kenney and Ms. Manko

**G. [AHBR 25-1500](#) 226 Brentwood Dr
Alterations (Front Porch, Siding, Windows)**

Attachments: [226 Brentwood Dr - AHBR Packet](#)
[Previously Approved Plans](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying and describing the house, reviewing

staff comments, and outlining the recommendations.

Mr. Dan Morman of Young and Me Homes provided additional details regarding the proposal. He explained the types of roofs being considered and noted that the architect intends for the porch to serve as a focal point. He stated that the corner boards in question could be modified if the Board prefers and that the two windows mentioned in the staff notes could be replaced with a single, larger window.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed several aspects of the design, including the front entrance roof, which is higher than the previous roof; the copper roof, which will complement the planned copper gutter system; and the chimney, which will be painted,

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

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

Absent: 2 - Ms. Kenney and Ms. Manko

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

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

Attachments: [6335 Elcrest Dr - AHBR Packet 2.11.26](#)
[6335 Elcrest Dr - AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Coffman opened the discussion by noting that a setback variance had already been granted by the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals (BZBA) for this application. She then reviewed staff comments and recommendations for the project.

Mr. Justin Englert and Mr. David Blinkworm of Tim Englert Construction explained that the lot is relatively flat and described the proposed addition, which will be set back 18 inches from the main mass of the house with floor heights matching the existing structure. They addressed build options suggested by staff, including alternatives to lower the roof height, and discussed the design of the gables on the front porch and garage. Mr. Englert also spoke about cost considerations related to lowering the roof lines.

He stated that the existing foundation will be matched and that the owners are open to modifying the small window on the first-floor rear elevation and the transom window on the second-floor rear elevation.

The Board, applicants, and staff reviewed several design elements, including confirmation that the front windows will remain unchanged, the possibility of retaining the existing front door opening but replacing the transoms with two doors, and three roof options: leaving the roof as proposed, raising it to two stories, or lowering it to the first-floor height. They also considered the farmhouse aesthetic created by a lowered porch roof and discussed various design features related to the roof, columns, and dormers.

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

Absent: 2 - Ms. Kenney and Ms. Manko

I. [AHBR 25-1497](#) 241 Ravenna Street

New House (Single-Family Dwelling)

Attachments: [241 Ravenna St - AHBR Packet](#)

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

Mr. Larn Reel of Wayne Homes distributed and discussed revised plans, addressing staff comments in detail. She explained that the revisions included adding a dormer, ensuring consistent siding around the house, incorporating window grids on all windows, creating a uniform foundation, and adding three windows to resolve fenestration concerns. She clarified that the absence of a porch on the original elevation was due to a CAD error. Ms. Reel also addressed the grade height and setback of the home.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed several design considerations, including the need for a consistent foundation around the house, the addition of an extra front gable, the use of brick extending to grade, and consistent trim around windows and doors. They also considered the possibility of enlarging the front porch and noted that this section of Ravenna Street is characterized by many simple one-story homes.

Mr. Workley moved to approve the application with specific conditions, and the motion was seconded by Ms. Marzulla. The conditions included the following: an added gable on the front elevation; matching siding around the house; consistent siding height around, the lower level to be exposed concrete block with a brick finish; windows to include grids; and three additional windows as shown on the revised elevations. The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Ms. Kenney and Ms. Manko

VII. Other Business

J. [AHBR 8424](#) 1957 Norton Rd (Informal)

New House (Single Family Dwelling)

Submitted by Matthew Neff

- a) *Section I-2(b) of the Architectural Design Standards state that new buildings and alterations shall respect the existing context and framework. Staff notes the overall design is not compatible with the existing architectural framework of this area. Suggest incorporating gable roofs, a more prominent and central front entryway, and window and door trim to be more compatible.*
- b) *Question if the house design could be rotated to provide a greater setback to the western property line and reduce impacts to wetlands and wetland setbacks.*
- c) *The Land Development Code requires the front setback to be within the average of the two adjacent properties and not differ by more than ten percent from the front yard setbacks of the two properties immediately*

adjacent to the subject property, unless approved by the AHBR. Staff notes the proposed house would have a front setback of 180 ft. The property to the west has a front yard setback of approximately 300 ft. The property to the east has a front yard setback of 840 ft; however, this is a flag lot with only 60 ft of frontage. The next home to the east has a setback of 35 ft.

- d) Section IV-4(b)(2) of the Architectural Design Standards state “The front face of the main body must sit forward at least 18” from the front face of the wings.” Staff notes the proposed wing is in line with the main mass. Revise the massing to meet this requirement.*
- e) Section III-1(g)(8) of the Architectural Design Standards state “large expanses of blank wall are to be avoided”. Fenestration placement should be at a minimum of approximately every 12 ft.” Incorporate additional fenestration placement to meet this requirement.*
- f) Section IV-4(c) of the Architectural Design Standards state “all roofs in all the wings must be of the same shape as the main body”. Staff notes that a flat roof is proposed for the garage wing while the main house has a shed roof.*
- g) Section IV-4(b)(2) of the Architectural Design Standards state “the building shall have a typical window used for most windows. Revise the overall window designs to meet this requirement.*
- h) Verify exposed foundation material.*

Attachments: [1957 Norton Rd - AHBR Packet](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by describing the vacant lot, noting that it contains wetlands and a stream and that the proposal will require a variance if it moves forward. He displayed and explained the proposed orientation of the house, which does not face the street, and requested feedback on the overall design.

The Board and staff discussed several aspects of the proposal, including how the design compares to adjoining neighborhood houses, the compatibility challenges posed by the shed, and the interior layout featuring 15- and 20-foot-high ceilings in portions of the house, which the Board described as having odd proportions. They also noted that the south window design appears proportionally unusual.

The Board expressed concerns about compatibility and stated that they would like additional information and an opportunity to speak directly with the applicant.

This matter was discussed

**K. [AHBR 1.14.2026](#) Minutes of Previous Architectural & Historic Board of Review Meeting:
January 14, 2026.**

Attachments: [January 14, 2026 AHBR Meeting Minutes - Draft](#)

A motion was made by Ms. Marzulla, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, that the January 14, 2026, Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Ms. Kenney and Ms. Manko

VIII. Staff Update

Ms. Coffman briefed the Board on requested edits to the historic district survey and raised the question of whether a specific product could be named as an AHBR-approved product rather than simply listed as preferred, while still leaving the option open for additional products to be considered in the future.

Mr. Sugar informed the Board that Naylor Wellman has resigned as the historic consultant, which leaves the Board without a consultant. He stated that he would begin by using the State website, which provides a list of recommended architects.

This matter was discussed

IX. Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Marzulla, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, that the meeting be adjourned at 9:52 p.m.. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Ms. Kenney 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.

* * *