



# City of Hudson, Ohio

## Meeting Minutes - Draft Architectural & Historic Board of Review

*John Caputo, Chair*  
*Allyn Marzulla, Vice Chair*  
*John Workley, Secretary*  
*Amy Manko*  
*Françoise Massardier-Kenney*  
*William Ray*  
*Jamie Sredinski*

*Nicholas Sugar, City Planner*  
*Amanda Krickovich, Associate Planner*

---

Wednesday, May 28, 2025

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. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray and Mr. Workley

**Absent:** 2 - Ms. Sredinski 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 Ms. Kenney, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray and Mr. Workley

#### A. [AHBR 25-260](#) 2380 Tyre Dr

Accessory Structure (Pavilion)

Attachments: [2380 Tyre Dr - AHBR Packet](#)

**This AHBR application was approved on the Consent Agenda.**

#### B. [AHBR 25-585](#) 85 Division Street (Historic District)

Accessory Structure (Siding Alteration)

Attachments: [85 Division Street Packet for AHBR](#)

**This AHBR application was approved on the Consent Agenda.**

## **V. Old Business**

### **A. [AHBR 25-474](#) 78 Aurora Street (Historic District)**

[Addition (Kitchen, Laundry Room, Elevator)]

**Attachments:**    [78 Aurora Street Packet For AHBR 5.14.25](#)  
[78 Aurora Street - AHBR Packet 5.28.2025](#)  
[Perspectus Report - 78 Aurora Street](#)  
[Preservation Brief #14 - Additions](#)  
[OHI Form](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying and reviewing the project, noting a site visit was conducted with the consultant, and reviewed the comments.

Ms. Rebecca Pantuso, Pantuso Architects, discussed the AHBR and historic consultants comments, including the one-foot bump out and the hip type roof (Victorian Tower).

The Board, staff, and applicant, discussed: The transom windows, that the pyramid type roof was chosen in order to reduce the size of the roof, that the proportions for the house and pyramid roof are good, and the Secretary of Interior Standards.

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

**Aye:** 5 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray and Mr. Workley

### **B. [AHBR 25-417](#) 7 College St. (Historic District)**

Accessory Structure - Fence (6 foot privacy)

Submitted by Heather Borowy, Northeast Ohio Fence

- a) Staff notes this application was tabled at the May 28th meeting.*
- b) Verify the proposed fence would be located behind the main mass of the house.*
- c) Question if the proposed fence would abut existing fences.*

**Attachments:**    [7 College Street Packet for AHBR](#)  
[7 College Street - AHBR Packet 5.28.25](#)

The applicant was not present for the meeting.

## **VI. New Business**

### **A. [AHBR 25-493](#) 80 N Oviatt St (Historic District)**

Accessory Structure - Fence (6 ft privacy)

Submitted by Heather Borowy, Northeast Ohio Fence

- a) Section III-1(f)(3) states "fence heights and materials shall be compatible with their site location and development". Staff notes the proposed fence would tie into and extend a neighboring fence. Submit additional photos of the area of the proposed fence and the existing neighboring fence to verify an*

*appropriate design and transition.*

Attachments:     [80 N Oviatt St - AHBR Packet](#)

The applicant was not present for the meeting.

**B.     [AHBR 25-524](#) 72 Aurora Street (Historic District)**

Addition (Guest Bathroom & Terrace)

Attachments:     [72 Aurora Street - AHBR Packet](#)  
                         [Preservation Brief #14 Additions](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying the house and reviewing the staff comments.

Mr. Eric Kuczek, applicant, noted the wood post in question is intended to match the previously installed wood post and pickets, and that more recent photos will be submitted.

The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed: That the existing railing was submitted and approved, that the new is differentiated from the existing, that a set of approved plans with aluminum exists, that the proposed railing will be visible from the street and this type of railing is not typically historical, the applicant's desire for the new rail to be consistent with the existing railing, the Board's desire not to introduce another material, that the door specifications have not been submitted, the possibility of moving the railing back so it is not seen from the public view, that this proposed railing is not appropriate for the public view.

The Board and applicant discussed the appropriate materials for the public view in the Historic District and that the new door to the outside will hopefully be a reused door.

The Board requested a submittal on the railing material and at least a photo of the door to be used.

**This matter was continued**

**C.     [AHBR 25-549](#) 118 Elm Street (Historic District)**

Fence (4 ft Split Rail)

Attachments:     [118 Elm St - AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying and describing the project, reviewing the staff comments and questions.

Mr. Robert Bronson, applicant, described how the proposed fence will connect to the neighboring fences - one a chain link fence, the other a stockade fence, displayed where the fence will be located, showed the minimal view of the fence from the street view, described why this type of fence was chosen and showed examples of the proposed fence from the surrounding neighborhood, the Board noted that the examples of neighboring fences were done prior to the standard change to eliminate chain link fences, staff questioned how the fence will be finished, noted the fence will not be functional without the mesh, discussed the applicant's willingness to make the fence black, the applicants willingness to move the fence to the back of the house on the side, the Board's previous decision's regarding the use of mesh, discussed the Board's concern of introducing metal mesh in the Historic District, and the applicant's willingness to use a four-foot wooden style fence with the final approval given by staff.

**A motion was made by Ms. Kenney, seconded by Mr. Workley, that this AHBR Application be approved with the following conditions: A height restriction of no more than five-feet high, that a wooden picket or shadow box style fence be installed, that is moved to the back of the house on the west side. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray and Mr. Workley

**D. [AHBR 25-393](#) 139 Hudson Street**

Accessory Structure (Detached Garage)

**Attachments:** [139 Hudson Street AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying the elevations and photos of the project.

Mr. Joe Matava, Peninsula Architects, described the site as 9.5 feet from the property line and out of the public view.

The Board, applicant, and staff, discussed: The location of the garage on the property, that the board and batten siding has been removed on the revised elevations, that gable returns have been added, that staff's suggestion of removing the hip roof will make the addition seem too large, that the windows were moved closer together to resolve the fenestration issue, and the proposed foundation was described.

The Board also discussed whether the existing garage has any historic significance.

**Ms Kenney made a finding, seconded by Mr. Ray, that the AHBR finds that the building or structure does not have historic or architectural significance and the applicant for such permit is not willing to voluntarily consent to the retention of such building or structure. The finding was approved by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray and Mr. Workley

**A motion was made by Mr. Ray, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, that the application be approved as shown in the revised drawings with the foundation to match the existing foundation materials. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray and Mr. Workley

**VII. Other Business****A. [AHBR 4.09.2025](#) Minutes of Previous Architectural & Historic Board of Review Meeting: April 9, 2025.****Attachments:** [April 9, 2025 - AHBR Meeting Minutes Draft](#)

**A motion was made by Ms. Marzulla, seconded by Ms. Kenney, that the April 9, 2025, Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray and Mr. Workley

**B. [AHBR 5.14.2025](#) Minutes of Previous Architectural & Historic Board of Review Meeting: May 14, 2025****Attachments:** [May 14, 2025 - AHBR Meeting Minutes Draft](#)

**A motion was made by Ms. Kenney, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, that the May 14, 2025, Minutes be approved as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray and Mr. Workley

**VIII. Staff Update**

There were no staff updates.

**IX. Adjournment**

**A motion was made by Ms. Marzulla, seconded by Mr. Workley, that the meeting be adjourned at 8:39 p.m... The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye: 5 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Ray and Mr. Workley**

---

**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.*

\* \* \*