

ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC BOARD OF REVIEW

CASE NO. 2022-730
REVISIONS TO NEW HOME DESIGN – PERMIT #22-730
5530 STONECREEK WAY

FINAL DECISION

Applicant Maher Holozadah submitted revisions to the previously approved house plans for 5530 Stonecreek Way after City Staff identified the changes during construction. The changes include:

1. Changes to the window design – The previously approved windows were designed to have window grids while the proposed design has a “prairie” style border.
2. Removal of the previously approved frieze boards along the second story for the front, left, right, and rear elevations.
3. Replacement of a section of previously approved siding with stone. This area is located between the proposed turret projection and front porch.

Based on the evidence presented by the applicant, Maher Holozadah and city staff at the Architectural and Historic Board of Review meeting held on April 8, 2026, the Architectural and Historic Board of Review approves changes #1 and #2 but denies change #3 for case #22-730, 5530 Stonecreek Way (Parcel #3009449).

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

Change #1 – Window Design: The proposed change complies with the Architectural Design Standards stipulations for window design for two-story wing type buildings, specifically, Section IV-4(e) stating “the building shall have a typical window used for most windows”. The board finds that, while the design has been changed, the new design would be consistent and compliant with the requirement.

Change #2 – Removal of previously proposed frieze boards: The proposed change complies with the Architectural Design Standards stipulations for “details”, specifically, Sections IV-4(f)(1) stating “details in the main body must be consistently applied throughout all sides of the main body” and Section IV-4(f)(2) stating “details in a wing must be consistently applied throughout all sides of that wing.”

Frieze boards are defined as a “detail” per the definition and accompanying figure (36) within Appendix 2 of the Architectural Design Standards. The Board finds there are no requirements for the frieze board detail and removing them is acceptable so long as they are applied, or, in this case, not applied, consistently.

Change #3 – Replacement of a section of previously approved stone with siding:

1. The proposal does not comply with Section IV-4(d)(3) stating “The materials used in any mass must be applied consistently on that mass on all sides of the structure.” Appendix 2 of the Architectural Design Standards define a “Mass” as “The main body, an “ell body”,

a wing, an intersecting mass or a central mass. Masses are usually distinguished by their plan and should be identifiable by a change in roof height or direction.”

The area in question is part of the main body mass. The “Main Body” is defined as “usually centrally located on the plan, is the largest (footprint and height) mass, and is different from all other masses in that it can be understood as a complete building if all the other masses were subtracted from it.”

Based on these findings, the materials used in this main body mass must be applied consistently on all sides of the structure. This would require application of the stone to each side of the mass (front, left, right, and rear). As previously approved, the stone was applied to separate masses/projections, which include the turret and front entryway. The separation from the turret and front entryway can be further distinguished by the “change in roof height and direction” as stated in the previously stated definition for masses.

2. Section IV-4(d)(1) of the Architectural Design Standards state “The walls of the main body must be a dominant material. Up to two additional materials may be used to call attention to the composition. For example, a different material may be used on building projections gable ends, entrance recesses, or to emphasize the horizontal or vertical division of the building.” While the walls of the main body would be a dominant material (horizontal siding), the AHBR finds a second material (stone) would not be consistent with the intent of this section to draw attention to very intentional architectural elements such as gable ends, entrance recesses, or the horizontal or vertical divisions of the building.

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. The overall design of the building is typical of the existing homes at Stonecreek Reserve Subdivision.

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 the previously approved horizontal siding that meets the design standards.
2. The variance is substantial, as the Architectural and Historic Board of Review has been consistent in administering and interpreting this code section. Approving the exception would create a precedent without merit.
3. The essential character of the neighborhood would not be substantially altered and the adjoining properties would not suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance
4. The variance would not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services such as water and sewer.
5. The owner purchased the property in 2020. The requirements were in place at this time. Had the applicant proposed the changes with the initial submittal, the Board would have explained these requirements in detail.
6. The applicant's predicament can be obviated feasibly through adjustments to the proposed wall material.
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