



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Draft Board of Zoning & Building Appeals

Lydia Bronstein, Chair
Robert Kahrl, Vice Chair
Robert Dyer
Keenan Jones
Cory Scott

Nick Sugar, City Planner
Mary Rodack, Associate Planner

Thursday, May 21, 2026

7:30 PM

Town Hall
27 East Main Street

I. Call to Order

Chair Bronstein called to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Zoning & Building Appeals 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 - Ms. Bronstein, Mr. Jones, Mr. Dyer, Mr. Kahrl and Mr. Scott

III. Identification, by Chairman, of City Staff

Chair Bronstein recognized City Planner Nick Sugar, Associate Planner Mary Rodack, and City Solicitor Marshall Pitchford.

IV. Swearing in of Staff and Audience Addressing the Board.

Ms. Bronstein swore-in staff and all the persons wishing to speak under oath.

V. Approval of Minutes

[BZBA 4.16.26](#) **Minutes of Previous Board of Zoning & Building Appeals Meeting: April 16, 2026**

Attachments: [April 16, 2026 BZBA Meeting Minutes - Draft](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Kahrl, seconded by Mr. Scott, that the April 16, 2026, Minutes be approved as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Bronstein, Mr. Jones, Mr. Dyer, Mr. Kahrl and Mr. Scott

VI. Public Hearings - New Business

[BZBA 26-363](#) **The subject of this hearing is a request for an appeal, pursuant to Section 1212.01(b), from the final decision made by the Architectural and**

Historic Board of Review on April 8, 2026, for a request for application of stone along a house mass for new home construction per AHBR case No. 2022-730.

The appellant and owners are Farah Holozadah and Hector Garcia of 5530 Stonecreek Way, Hudson, Ohio 44236.

Attachments: [26-363 5530 Stonecreek Way - Staff Report](#)

Ms. Rodack introduced the application by outlining the construction history, noting that the work had not been completed according to the approved plans, and summarizing the staff comments .

Mr. Maher Holozadah, 12107 Nathaniel Lane, Twinsburg, Ohio, father of the homeowner, explained that the approved plans showed a portion of the home with vinyl siding . He described how the decision was instead made to apply stone to the entire area rather than leaving a small portion without it. He emphasized that this was not an effort to cut corners or reduce costs; in fact, the change increased both the curb appeal and the overall value of the home at a higher expense. He also stated that the stone terminates at inside corners and is less prominent in person than it appears on the plans. In addition, he referenced Section 1.2, which outlines the purpose of the standards and the five principles on which they are based, and stated that he does not believe the stone violates those principles.

Ms. Farah Holozadah, the homeowner, stated that this is her dream home and that they have attempted to follow all applicable guidelines.

Chair Bronstein reviewed the Standards of Review from the LDC as they relate to the change from vinyl to stone on a small section of the home and discussed how those standards apply to the appeal .

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed the hardship that would result from the cost of removing the stone and replacing it with vinyl. It was noted that applying a less expensive material could detract from the home's appearance. Mr. Holozadah stated his belief that staff and the AHBR Chair were encouraging a specific outcome, and that during construction it became clear to the applicants that stone was the better choice for the area in question. He added that there was not sufficient time to bring the change to AHBR for review . Discussion included whether the findings-of-fact correctly identified the area as part of the main mass of the house, which Mr. Holozadah disputed, and whether technical issues had influenced AHBR's general inclination to approve the "as built" condition. Mr. Holozadah stated that BZBA should be allowed to exercise its own discretion; however, the Board noted that under 2025 law, only an abuse of discretion may be reversed .

Staff clarified that the BZBA cannot grant a variance from a design standard, as such authority lies solely with the AHBR.

Further discussion took place regarding the difficulty of reversing the AHBR decision, particularly concerning the determination that the area in question is part of the main mass of the house-a conclusion that at least some Board members agreed was reasonable. Mr. Holozadah expressed concern that the technical rules that classify this area as part of the main mass may be leading to an unfavorable decision . The Board noted that, based on its

review of the AHBR meeting, it does not believe staff's comments influenced the AHBR's conclusion. The sequence of construction was discussed; the decision to use stone was made prior to the installation of vinyl siding. The Board also observed that several neighboring homes feature both stone and vinyl and generally comply with the Standards. Members noted communication difficulties at the previous meeting, including staff attempts to suggest ways the homeowner might obtain approval. The cost to remove the stone and replace it with vinyl remains unknown. It was also noted that there were no discussions with the contractors about building outside the approved plans, and no exceptional conditions were presented to AHBR to justify the change, with Mr. Holozadah acknowledging that no exceptional reason existed.

In concluding remarks, Mr. Holozadah stated that replacing the stone with vinyl would involve a significant cost.

Mr. Holozadah thanked the Board for its time and commented that some homes in the neighborhood comply with the LDC Standards while others do not.

The Board discussed that a written decision will be required for this appeal and confirmed that a decision will be issued within the allotted time.

This matter was discussed

[BZBA 26-420](#) The subject of this hearing is a variance request to construct an accessory structure garage for the City of Hudson Fire Station property. The request is to allow an accessory structure to be constructed in the side yard when the Land Development Code prohibits accessory structures from being located in the side yard pursuant to section 1206.03(d)(3), "Accessory Uses/Structure - Accessory Use Development and Operation Standards.

The applicant and owner is the City of Hudson, of 1140 Terex Rd, Hudson Ohio 44236.

Attachments: [26-420 40 S Oviatt St - Staff Report](#)

Ms. Rodack introduced the application by describing the property, noting that a lot consolidation is underway, that the proposed building will serve the Fire Department, and that the issue before the Board involves a 100-percent deviation from the side-yard code requirement. She explained that, although the structure is technically located in the side yard, it sits behind the existing fire station.

Mr. Tony Calabro, Construction Manager with Hudson City Engineering, explained the purpose of the building and stated that the chosen location minimizes impacts to green space while allowing improved access for fire vehicles.

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed the vehicles, trailers, and emergency response equipment that will be stored in the building and noted that response times-especially in winter-will improve. They discussed the size of the structure, which is based on the number and size of the vehicles it must house. Mr. Calabro discussed several alternative layouts and placements that were considered, but historic trees, paths, and trails limited

available options. Staff noted that they had consulted with the Police Department, which determined the building would not affect police operations. It was also confirmed that the existing driveway will remain unchanged.

Staff explained the ongoing parcel consolidation, the nature of the 100-percent side-yard violation, and that once consolidated, the police department will be included on the new parcel. Staff stated that the proposed location is the most suitable site for the structure and reviewed how side-yard calculations are determined. Staff also noted that the standards may allow a minority of a building's floor area to be in the side yard, reviewed the property's history, and stated that if the original building on the site were still standing, the proposed building would be considered to be in the rear yard.

The Board and applicant noted that two trees, each less than eight inches in diameter, would be affected by the project. This matter has been reviewed with the City Arborist. It was also confirmed that the existing sidewalk will not be impacted.

There were no public comments.

The Board discussed that, in practical terms, the proposed building appears to be in the rear yard, and that it will be screened by the wing of the existing building. The Board observed that the proposed location represents the most reasonable solution for the site.

A motion was made by Mr. Scott, seconded by Mr. Jones, that this Variance be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ms. Bronstein, Mr. Jones, Mr. Dyer, Mr. Kahrl and Mr. Scott

VII. Other Business

Ms. Rodack reviewed the applications scheduled for the June meeting.

Chair Bronstein noted that she and Mr. Kahrl had received a request to attend a meeting as representatives of the Board regarding Clinton Crossing. Mr. Sugar explained how that meeting process will proceed.

VIII. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Kahrl, that this be adjourned. The motion carried by an unanimous vote.

Lydia Bronstein, Chair

Robert Kahrl, Vice Chair

Joe Campbell, Executive Assistant

Upon approval by the Board of Zoning & Building Appeals, 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 .

* * *