



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Draft 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, September 24, 2025

7:30 PM

Town Hall
27 East Main Street

I. Call To Order

Acting Chair Marzulla 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 - Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 2 - Mr. Caputo 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

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Kenney, to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Mr. Caputo and Ms. Manko

A. [AHBR 25-1173](#) 190 W Streetsboro St

Sign (Ground Sign)

Submitted by Splott Graphics

a) *Staff recommends approval as submitted.*

Attachments: [190 W Streetsboro St - AHBR Packet final](#)

This AHBR application was approved on the Consent Agenda.

V. Old Business

A. [AHBR 25-1021](#) 176 Elm St (Historic District)

Alterations (Siding, Window Trim & Shutters)

Submitted by Reuben Yoder

Staff notes a site visit was held on September 3, 2025.

The AHBR requested the review of the Architectural consultant to visit the site, consider if the home is contributing to the Historic District and whether or not the proposed siding materials are appropriate. The consultant's report and recommendation is attached for the Board's consideration.

Attachments:

[176 Elm St - AHBR Packet](#)

[176 Elm St - Consultant Report](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by noting a site visit was conducted, reviewing the project and historic consultants report which notes wood siding is on the structure, that the Board must determine whether the siding is to be restored or replaced with like material.

Mr. Reuben Yoder, stated his intent is to install vinyl material, subject to the Board's agreement.

The Board noted that wood or Hardie Board may be used within the historic district, but vinyl siding is not an approved material. The applicant stated he would likely not reuse the original wood siding.

Mr. Sugar noted the historic consultant's report suggestions for materials are typically not approved in Hudson.

A motion was made by Ms. Kenney, seconded by Mr. Workley, that this AHBR Application be DENIED. The denial is based on the following reasons: Vinyl is NOT an approved material in the Historic District, the Secretary of the Interior Standards that the existing siding should be evaluated regarding repair or replacement, and that if replaced must be with a similar material per Preservation Brief 16. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Mr. Caputo and Ms. Manko

VI. New Business

A. [AHBR 25-1194](#) 72 N Main Street (Historic District)

Commercial Sign (Hanging Sign)

Submitted by Marie Cipolletta, Signarama

a) *Section V-5(c)(3) states "Signs should have a matte finish, not have a glossy or reflective finish." Verify a matte finish.*

b) *Question how proposed materials and design are compatible with the surrounding signs. Staff recommends the sign be constructed of High Density Urethane (HDU) or wood, similar to the other surrounding hanging signs.*

Attachments:

[72 N Main St - AHBR Packet](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the site, describing the location, and reviewing the staff

report.

Ms. Cipolletta, contractor, noted matte vinyl letters are being used with HDU materials, Mr. Sugar stated the updated sign materials are similar to other sign materials in the area.

A motion was made by Ms. Kenney, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, that this AHBR Application be approved as amended with a matte finish and HDU materials. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Mr. Caputo and Ms. Manko

B. [AHBR 25-1195](#) 98 N Main St (Historic District)

Sign (Wall & Hanging Sign)

Submitted by Melanie Brunty

a) Revise submitted elevations to verify proposed materials, dimensions, and finish would match the existing signage.

Attachments: [98 N Main St - AHBR Packet](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the site, reviewing the staff comments, and sign locations.

Mr. David McIlvaine, Owner, noted the front sign will only replace the lettering in the same font to indicate the business is not a butcher shop anymore, the hanging sign front sign lettering will reflect the large sign, and the rear sign will be moved to the left side of the dumpster enclosure on the freezer area.

The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed, the location of the rear sign,

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Kenney, that this AHBR Application be approved as amended with staff approving the rear sign. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Mr. Caputo and Ms. Manko

C. [AHBR 25-930](#) 38 Church St (Historic District)

Fence (6-foot privacy)

Submitted by Jeff Becka, R&T Fence Inc

Question if the proposed fence would abut any existing fences.

Attachments: [38 Church St - AHBR Packet](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by describing the fence and reviewing the staff comments.

Mr. John and Ms. Cynthia Dearborn, noted there is nothing abutting the proposed new fence.

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

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

Absent: 2 - Mr. Caputo and Ms. Manko

D. [AHBR 25-1193](#) 130 Elm St

Alteration (Roof Replacement)

Submitted by Bill Buehl, A&B Roofing

- a) *Verify the existing roof material and if there are any differences in proposed material.*
- b) *Question how materials would blend with the existing roof shingles.*

Attachments: [130 Elm Street - AHBR Packet](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by describing the materials and work to be done, and the work will be on the rear of the structure.

Mr. Billy Buehl, A & B Roofing, noted the same materials will be used on the back of the house as were used on the front of the house.

The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed, the shingles being appropriate for this house.

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

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

Absent: 2 - Mr. Caputo and Ms. Manko

E. [AHBR 25-1196](#) 31 Church Street (Historic District)

Alteration (Window Replacements)

Submitted by Pavlo Puts

- a) *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation state that deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence. Provide documentation verifying the need for replacement.*
- b) *Staff notes Pella Lifestyle windows are proposed, as well as composite doors. Revise the proposed door to wood and question the Pella Lifestyle as a replacement for historic wood windows. Staff notes the Pella Architectural Series is typically preferred as a replacement.*

Attachments: [31 Church Street - AHBR Packet](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by describing the project, displaying the house, and reviewing the staff comments including the window and door types.

Mr. Evan Selby, invited the Board to conduct a site visit to see the deterioration of the windows, and noted the cost of windows.

The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed: The style of the proposed windows will match the existing, that the rear addition windows are leaky, that various door and window materials were used around the building. The Board noted that it is difficult to understand what window materials and types are being used, that a site visit be conducted, that elevations with the existing profiles, and proposed profiles with photos and explications of why the windows need to be submitted in order for the Board to understand the condition of the windows.

Ms. Kenney made a motion, seconded by Mr. Brown, that the application be continued to the next meeting, so that: A site visit may be conduct, photos of the proposed windows to be

replaced, and profiles of the windows may be submitted. The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Mr. Caputo and Ms. Manko

F. [AHBR 25-1093](#) 358 Oldham Way

Addition (3 Seasons Room)

Submitted by Dylan Hart, Portage Timberworks

- a) *Section IV-4 of the Architectural Design Standards state that Additions should be designed to be compatible with the main structure by incorporating materials and a foundation to match. Revise elevations to depict full foundation to match the existing home.*
- b) *Submit product spec sheets of all proposed external materials.*

Attachments: [358 Oldham Way - AHBR Packet 10.8.2025](#)

[358 Oldham Way - AHBR Packet](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the site plan, describing the project, and reviewing the staff comments.

Mr. Brian Harris, homeowner, and Mr. Dillon Hart, Portage Timberworks, were present for the meeting. The applicant state he believes, and described why he believes, the project meets the LDC and distributed information to the Board which describe why he believes this.

The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed: The location of a comparison house, that the addition does have a pier foundation as opposed to a continuous foundation, that historically the Board has not allowed the proposed foundation, that livable space without a foundation is not permitted, that an alternative plan is available with a continuous foundation which were distributed to the Board members and described, the proposed cantilever, that the applicant is willing to eliminate the cantilever, the Board reiterated the need for a foundation, and discussed the possibility of eliminating the cantilever, change the arches, and reducing the size of the windows, as well as various other alternative builds. The applicant and staff discussed the timeline of the approval process.

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, that this AHBR Application be continued with revised plans. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Mr. Caputo and Ms. Manko

G. [AHBR 25-611](#) 85 Division Street (Historic District)

Addition (Bedroom)

Submitted by Johnathan Flemming

- a) *Question age of the existing rear wing addition.*
- b) *Question if the gables and window trim are accurately depicted in the submitted elevations.*
- c) *The National Park Service Preservation Brief for additions states new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old. Question impact of proposed addition on the historic mass and the removal of historic materials. Suggest inseting the addition or creating a clearer transition point to create a*

visible break between masses.

- d) The National Park Service Preservation Brief for additions states new additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired. Question the removal of a portion of the rear roofline and facade to accommodate the proposed addition.*
- e) Question how siding would be blended on the east elevation.*
- f) Submit spec sheets of all proposed exterior materials.*

Attachments: [85 Division St - Updated plans](#)

Mr. Sugar introduced the application by displaying the site plan, and the project.

Mr. Jonathan Flemming, Jonathan Paul Flemming Architecture, described the denial of a requested setback variance, the revised plan being discussed, the history of building projects at the house, how the proposed addition compliments the existing house, reviewed the various proposed elevations, noted the materials to be used which will tie back to the existing house,

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed: That the recent addition and the proposed addition do not cause conflict with the Secretary of the Interior's standards, that the transom windows are to bring more light into the house, the square footage increase of 318 feet, that the downspout begin at the proposed addition, that the transom windows be separated, that the shed roof over the door not be part of the house roof - that it be a separate roof, that inseting the addition is possible but the space lost would be detrimental to the function of the room, that the current rear addition was constructed around 2001, that the applicant is unable to determine the end of the original house, that the historic mass of the structure is not being affected by this addition, that the Board continue the application to allow for revised drawings and the materials specifications. Mr. Flemming stated none of the windows on the rear will be reused. That the staff comment regarding not destroying historic materials does not apply the work on the 2001 addition.

Mr. Workley made a motion, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, that the meeting be continued to allow for: Alternate number 3 elevation be used with the shed roof, the east elevation be divided by the gutter notation to give distinction to the two additions, the west side window be a single long window with a transom on top, that the details be minimized, that Pella Reserved windows be used, and the exterior materials specifications be submitted. The motion was approved by the following vote:

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

Absent: 2 - Mr. Caputo and Ms. Manko

VII. Other Business

[AHBR 9.10.2024](#) **Minutes of Previous Architectural & Historic Board of Review Meeting:
September 10, 2025.**

Attachments: [September 10, 2025 - AHBR Meeting Minutes Draft](#)

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

Aye: 4 - Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 2 - Mr. Caputo and Ms. Manko

Abstain: 1 - Ms. Kenney

VIII. Staff Update

Mr. Sugar noted an upcoming of the Historic Landmark Committee.

Ms. Marzulla requested more exposure of the need to come before boards prior to beginning work.

IX. Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Kenney, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, that this be adjourned at 9:21 p.m.. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 2 - Mr. Caputo and Ms. Manko

Abstain: 1 - Ms. Kenney

Allyn Marzulla, Acting 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.

* * *