

City of Hudson
Board of Zoning and Building Appeals

October 20, 2025

Docket no. 2025-1267
Decision of the Board

This is an appeal from the Final Decision of the Architectural & Historic Board of Review ("AHBR") of August 27, 2025 in its case no. 2025-1042 and dated September 10, 2025, denying a request by Appellant Jaume Franquesa, the homeowner of 2160 Bristol Court, the property in question, for a waiver allowing Appellant to replace the siding on three sides of the house with vinyl siding and the front of the house with a stone facing. Specifically, the AHBR recited the following standard in the Land Development Code:

APPENDIX D – Architectural Design Standards

Section IV-4(d)(1)

d. Materials.

- (1) 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 divisions of the building.
- (2) The wings may have a different material for the wall than the main body.
- (3) The materials used in any mass must be applied consistently on that mass on all sides of the structure.

The house faces north. The contractor had already removed the previous siding from the north side of the house and had installed stone facing on the north wall of the garage, when a stop work order was issued by the City. The request for a waiver followed.

Appellant had submitted to the Board, inter alia, a series of photographs of nearby homes, along with written testimony that 80% of the houses in the immediate proximity to his home had front facings of masonry and white aluminum siding on the remaining sides, and that the majority of homes in the Weston Hills subdivision where this home is situated also had masonry or stone front facades, with aluminum siding on the remaining three sides of these homes. No homes in the subdivision have masonry on all four sides of the main structure.

In the August 27 hearing, the compatibility of the neighborhood was not discussed. The only comment made by the AHBR was that the neighboring homes were constructed before the Design Standards were enacted. The AHBR in its final decision made a single finding, which reads as follows:

The AHBR finds the proposed stone application across the front façade is in direct conflict with the requirement of Appendix D – Architectural Design Standards Section IV-4(d) stating *“the materials used in any mass must be applied consistently on that mass on all sides of the structure.”*

No findings were made regarding Appellant’s request for a waiver, and no reasons were given for denying a waiver.

At the hearing on the appeal, the Board went into executive session to consider the applicable law governing this appeal. Back on the public record, the Board stated that it would not take evidence or testimony or argument in this appeal because the Final Decision of the AHBR from which the appeal was taken contained no findings regarding the request for a waiver. Therefore, this Board finds that the AHBR’s final decision was incomplete because the LDC clearly requires that the AHBR provide a well-supported explanation and reasons for denial of the requested waiver. This finding is required by § 1212.01(g) of the LDC. Accordingly, the Board has unanimously approved a motion to remand this case to the AHBR with instructions to make findings adequate to support its denial of a waiver.

The Board is required by § 1212.01(g) to give instructions to the AHBR to “conduct further analysis, explain its reasoning more clearly . . . and issue a new, more thorough and well-supported explanation for its factual determinations.” The Board has determined that it is necessary for the ABHR to collect additional evidence, if necessary, and to make findings on each of the factors that govern the granting of waivers. The AHBR may waive any requirement of the Design Standards if the proposed project meets the below principles set out in APPENDIX D, Section I-2:

Does the requested waiver meet the standard of “the public realm takes precedence over individual buildings?”

Does the requested waiver conform to maintain[ing] a high level of architectural quality?

Does the waiver respect the land and the environment in which this structure is placed?

Does the waiver contribute to variety within a defined framework?

Does the proposed alteration respect the existing context and framework, that is, the character of the surrounding neighborhood?

as well as meeting one of the two conditions listed in Section II-1:

Is the project designed in response to a unique situation?

Are there exceptional and unique conditions that create a practical difficulty in complying with the provision sought to be waived?

This Board respectfully requests that this matter be placed on the AHBR's calendar for its October 29 meeting, and its revised and supplemented decision, including express consideration of the Appellant's argument and evidence, be forwarded to the Board for consideration in advance of its November 20 meeting.

This matter is REMANDED to the AHBR for further proceedings, including the gathering of additional evidence, if necessary, responses to Appellant's arguments, and the issuance of additional findings of fact, all in accordance with this decision.

For the Board:

Louis Wagner

Louis Wagner, Chair

Lydia Bronstein

Lydia Bronstein, Vice Chair

Louis Wagner

Louis Wagner

Keenan Jones

Keenan Jones

Robert Kahrl

Robert Kahrl

Cory Scott

Cory Scott