



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT • 1140 Terex Road • Hudson, Ohio 44236 • (330) 342-1790

## **ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC BOARD OF REVIEW**

### **CASE NO. 25-361 ALTERATIONS – RESIDENTIAL WINDOWS AND SHUTTERS 33 E. STREETSBORO STREET**

#### **FINAL DECISION**

Based on the evidence presented by the applicant, Tracey Crawford, 33 E. Streetsboro Street and city staff at the Architectural and Historic Board of Review meeting held on February 11, 2026, the Architectural and Historic Board of Review denies the residential window and shutter proposal for case #25-361, 33 E. Streetsboro Street (Parcel #3201466).

The Architectural and Historic Board of Review makes the following Findings of Fact:

1. The proposal does not comply with Section III-2 (b)(3)(ii)(b) of the Architectural Design Standards (Appendix D) stating “Substitute materials are acceptable provided they are compatible in proportion, size, style, composition, design, color, and texture with the existing historic materials.” The Board finds that the proposed vinyl-clad windows and shutters are not comprised of an appropriate substitute material for the Historic District and therefore are in direct conflict with this requirement.
2. The proposal does not comply with Section I-1 of the Architectural Design Standards (Appendix D) stating “The City has a responsibility to maintain a high quality "public realm" and character”
3. The proposal does not comply with Section I-2(b) of the Architectural Design Standards (Appendix D) stating "Buildings shall maintain a high level of architectural quality. “
4. The proposal does not comply with Section I-2(e) of the Architectural Design Standards (Appendix D) stating “New buildings and alterations shall respect the existing context and framework.” The property is located within the historic district where vinyl windows and vinyl shutters are not appropriate.
5. The proposal does not comply with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation (Appendix 1) stating “new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.” The proposed vinyl windows and vinyl shutters would not be compatible with the historic architectural features on this property and with the surrounding historic district.
6. The Board finds that the window series installed by the applicant is not consistent with the final approved plans for case #25-361 and that no approval was granted by the AHBR for this deviation.

Furthermore, the AHBR will not grant an exception pursuant to the review criteria established in Section II-1. The AHBR finds that the proposal is not of an exceptional design, meaning it is not especially creative nor is it designed in response to a unique situation, such as a very difficult site or an unusual program requirement.

No exceptional or unusual conditions exist that are not common to other areas similarly situated and there is no resulting practical difficulty based on the following findings:

1. The property in question will yield a reasonable return and there can be beneficial use of the property without the variance. The applicant can propose and install an alternate window series that meets the design standards.
2. The variance is substantial, as the Architectural and Historic Board of Review has been consistent in its determination that vinyl is not an acceptable or appropriate substitute for historic materials.
3. The essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered and the adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance. The property is located within the Historic District and, therefore, is required to comply with all applicable Historic District design standards.
4. The variance would not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services such as water and sewer.
5. The owner purchased the property in 2011. The requirements were in place at this time.
6. The applicant's predicament can be obviated feasibly through adjustments to the proposed window material and design.
7. The spirit and intent behind the requirement would not be observed and substantial justice would not be done by granting the exception.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

CITY OF HUDSON  
ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC  
BOARD OF REVIEW

---

John Caputo, Chair