

To: Nick Sugar, City Planner City of Hudson
From: Olivia Hopkins, AIA | Historic Architecture, Perspectus
Date: May 22, 2025
Re: 78 Aurora Street
CC: Lauren Pinney Burge, AIA, Principal | Historic Architecture, Perspectus

SUBJECT PROPERTY: 78 Aurora Street

At the request of the City of Hudson, Ohio and per their Codified Ordinances Section 1202.04(b)(3), Perspectus is providing this advisory report to assist the Architectural and Historic Board of Review (AHBR) in their review of the Owner Application requesting alterations to the designated historic property. The following were applied as it pertains to this application under the Codified Ordinances Appendix D. - Architectural Design Standards Section III-2.b.(1):

1. Codified Ordinances Appendix D. - Architectural Design Standards Section III-2 (attached as **EXHIBIT A**)
2. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (attached as **EXHIBIT B**)
3. National Park Service Preservation Briefs #14 Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns & #16 The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors.

Perspectus performed the following:

1. Reviewed the submitted documentation for the appropriateness of the proposal, compliance with above referenced documents, and general insights on the submittal.
2. Conducted a site visit on May 20, 2025.

QUALIFICATIONS

Lauren Pinney Burge, Principal, Historic Architecture, is a registered Architect in the state of Ohio, meets Federal Qualifications (36 CFR 61) for Architectural History, Architecture, Historic Architecture and Historic Preservation Planning, and is Section 106 Trained.

Olivia Hopkins is a registered Architect in the state of Ohio, meets Federal Qualifications (36 CFR 61) for Architecture, Architectural History, and Historic Architecture.

PROPOSED CHANGES

The owner proposes to make the following changes to the existing structure:

1. Constructing, at the rear, a two-story addition with an exposed basement. The addition will be visible when walking northeast on Aurora Street and will be slightly hidden while walking southwest on Aurora Street.
 - a. **Massing:** The addition is roughly rectangular in plan and extends from the rear, southeast, elevation of the house and extends slightly beyond the boundaries of the previous addition. The main gable roof will be extended further to the rear, southeast, until it intersects with a new side, southwest/northeast, facing intersecting gable. The proposed extension of the roof is at the same height as the historic house. The proposed intersecting gable's roof ridge line is set below the historic house's roof ridge line. The existing exposed basement wall with the tile foundation will remain, the first and second floor walls will be new and align with the basement wall. The side of the intersecting gable will be visible when viewing the house from the front. The rear, southeast, elevation of the proposed addition has a cantilevered screened in porch at the first floor with enclosed building mass above with a shed roof. The side, southwest wall of the rear mass is aligned with the historic house wall. The southeast corner of the proposed addition connects to the existing detached garage. This mass is a stair and elevator tower with a pyramid roof, which does not tie into the rest of the proposed addition. The side, northeast, elevation has a one story, shed roof portion which extends past the historic house wall, then is steps back to be setback from the plane of the historic house. The intersecting gable is present at the second floor on this side, northeast, elevation.
 - b. **Solid/Void:** The proposed window to wall ratio is similar to the historic house. The proposed windows on the front and sides have a similar head height to the historic windows. Some of the windows are shorter than the historic. The windows have a similar spacing to the historic house. The rear windows are shorter than the other windows. On the side, northeast, elevation at the one story shed roof, there are skylights in the roof. There is a proposed door at the basement level on the side, southwest, elevation.
 - c. **Materials:** The proposed materials include: foundation – new CMU with parging. Note: It was discussed on site that the tile at the basement on the side, southwest, elevation could be parged over to allow for the entire

addition to have a distinct foundation from the original; trim and siding – to match existing; roofing – tile roof to match existing on the main masses and asphalt shingles on the one-story portions, with low slopes, which matches the front porch; gutter and fascia – to match existing; screen porch – Boral paneling.

- d. **Detailing:** The proposed windows are 1 over 1 double hung windows and two on the rear, southeast, are paired 1 over 1 double hung windows. The proposed window head trim on the sides, southwest and northeast, elevations match the triangular head trim on the historic house. The window head trim at the rear, southeast, elevation is a simplified rectangular trim. The proposed new operable shutters on the sides and front will match the shutters on the historic house. The proposed brackets at the stair and elevator tower and the screened porch match the front porch brackets. The screened porch has Boral paneling on the first floor and the second floor on the side and rear.
2. Replacing, at the side, southwest, elevation at the first floor a historic double hung window with a pair of full glass French doors.
3. Removing, at the rear, the previous addition.

APPROPRIATENESS OF PROPOSED CHANGES

1. **Proposed changes #1-2: can become appropriate** with the following alterations to the design:
 - a. **Change #1:** These modifications will assist the proposed design to better adhere to Secretary of Interior's Standards #9, which states, "The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features..."
 - i. **Massing:** Typically, the square footage size and length of the proposed addition would be inappropriate, but the historic house has an existing addition and the proposed addition roughly stays within the footprint of this existing addition. Visual distinction between the historic house and the proposed addition should be increased to allow the historic house to dominate the massing and allow a visual break between the two masses. The extension of the main roof ridge should be lowered to allow for the historic portion of the roof to be separate. The proposed stair and elevator tower begins to read as a distinct and separate feature not integrated into the overall design. The pyramid roof form does not appear on the house at any other locations and is an inappropriate roof form design for this style house. Study the potential of creating a rear or side facing gable to allow the roof to fit into the overall house design better. Or study a way to connect the pyramid roof back to the main portion of the addition. On the side, northeast, elevation do not have the addition step past the historic wall plane. The addition should be inset to allow for the historic mass on this elevation to have a visual break.
 - ii. **Solid/Void:** The skylights on the side, northeast, elevation, while they introduce a new feature to the house, will not be highly visible from the public right of way due to the setback from the street and the height of the proposed roof and would be acceptable.
 - iii. **Materials:** The house features numerous types of foundation materials from previous alterations. While parging over the existing tile on the side, southwest, elevation will be covering a unique material, the intention of making the foundation at the entire addition one distinct material from the historic house is acceptable. The window material is not specified on the drawings. Please note the following requirements for windows based on the National Park Service Secretary of Interior's Standards, Standard #6.
 1. Wood or aluminum clad wood are historically appropriate because of the ability to match historic profiles, and these windows are also more durable with a longer estimated service life. Vinyl windows are an inappropriate solution to replace windows in a historically significant structure.
 - iv. **Detailing:** The proposed detailing at the window heads, on the sides and front, along with roof brackets are designed to match the historic detailing. These detail elements should be simplified to allow the historic house to be distinct from the proposed addition. Consider using a rectangular trim around the proposed windows. Secretary of Interior's Standards #3 states, "...Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features..., shall not be undertaken." Consider removing the porch brackets altogether to better adhere to the SIS.
 - b. **Change #2:** While removing the window will remove historic material from the historic house, this is on the side elevation under a large porch overhang but consider using a single door instead of French doors to lessen the impact of the window to wall ratio.
2. **Proposed change # 3: are appropriate and compliant.**

SOURCES CONSULTED

1. AHBR Agenda Packet with OHI Form and proposed drawings by Pantuso Architecture.
2. AHBR Meeting Agenda Minutes, 78 Aurora Street, 5/14/2025.

3. House Report for HHA Historic Marker: 78 Aurora Street, 1994. Hudson Heritage Association (HHA).
4. Grimmer, Anne and Weeks, Kay. *Preservation Briefs 14 New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns*. National Parks Service US Department of the Interior Technical Preservation Services. August 2022.
5. Sandor, John, Trayte, David and Uebel, Amy. *Preservation Briefs 16 The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors*. National Parks Service US Department of the Interior Technical Preservation Services. September 2023.
6. Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI) form by L Newkirk and F Barlow
7. McAlester, Virginia. *A Field Guide to American Houses*. Fifth printing, Alfred A. Knopf, 2020.
8. National Register of Historic Place Form by Thirza M. Cady, Asst. to Janet Sprague. *Hudson Historic District Reference Number 73001542*. April 7, 1973.
9. National Register of Historic Place Form by Lois Newkirk. *Hudson Historic District (Boundary Increase) Reference Number 89001452*. August 19, 1989.
10. National Register of Historic Place Form by Wendy Naylor and Diana Wellman. *Hudson Historic District (Boundary Increase) Reference Number 100007849*. April 15, 2022.
11. Chambers & Chambers Architects and Betty-Lee Francis. *Uniform Architectural Criteria for the Architectural and Historic Board of Review Village of Hudson Ohio*. April 1977.

FINDINGS

1. The structure is located in and contributing to the Hudson National Register Historic District, reference numbers 73001542, 89001452, and 100007849. The Period of Significance for the district is 1806-1963. The district is significant under Criteria A and Criteria C.
 - a. The significance under Criteria A as stated in the 1973 National Register Nomination (NRN): "Hudson is a fine example of the early development of the Connecticut Western Reserve both in architecture and town planning." As stated in the 1989 Boundary Increase, "...Boundary Increase is significant under Criteria A, in that the development of the railroad-based economy, with its consequent land development schemes...the community planning and historic restoration movement in the early 20th century are associated with and make a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history." As stated in the 2022 NRN the collection of structures included within the expanded boundary, "demonstrates the pattern of development in Hudson extending from the late nineteenth century post-railroad era decline...continues through the 1950s with the Ellsworth legacy of planning and resulting exurban pattern of growth..."
 - b. The significance under Criteria C as stated in the 1989 NRN; "...Boundary Increase...is significant under Criteria C in that it contains distinctive architectural styles and property types which reflect the history of the area, in its progression in style from Federal to Transitional, Greek Revival, Gothic Revival, Italianate, Queen Anne and twentieth century period revivals." As stated in the 2022 NRN, the collection of structures included within the expanded boundary is "...representative of building styles and types built in the late nineteenth century and dominated by the Colonial Revival style influences..."
 - c. The 1989 Boundary Increase states, "Aurora Street is the local segment of the old Chillicothe Road, laid out in 1802 to connect Lake Erie to the State capital at Chillicothe."
2. The property is located on the south side of the street, the third structure from the corner of Aurora Street and College Street in the Historic Residential Neighborhood Zoning District. The terrain slopes down from the front of the house to the rear, exposing the full height of the basement at the rear of the house.
3. The structure is approximately square in plan and two stories tall. The structure has wood Dutch lap siding. The windows are a mix of wood with storm windows and vinyl. The foundation is a mix of tile, brick, and CMU. The roof is red clay tile on the house and asphalt shingles on the porch and low sloped sections. The structure has influences from the Colonial Revival style and is a "T" plan mass as described in Uniform Architectural Criteria.
4. According to the Ohio Historic Inventory, the structure was built c1880. The OHI form states, "the lower front windows altered."
5. According to information from the Hudson Heritage Association the structure was built by Charles Witty. Historic photographs from the Hudson Heritage Association and 1989 NRN Boundary increase show alterations remove the front door overhang, add a front wrap around porch, a second story to the one-story east wing and a rear addition, no date was provided for these alterations.



Image 1: 1989. Photograph from 1989 Hudson Historic District (Boundary Increase) National Register of Historic Places form. The house at 78 Aurora Street is indicated by the red arrow.



Image 2: No date. Photograph from Hudson Heritage Association house package.



Image 3: Front, northwest, elevation.



Image 4: Side, southwest, elevation. The red box indicates the window to be removed. The yellow box indicates the previous addition to be removed.



Image 5: Rear, southeast, elevation.



Image 6: Side, northeast, elevation. The yellow box indicates the previous addition to be removed.



Image 7: Side, northeast, elevation.



Image 8: Neighboring houses to the northeast.



Image 9: Neighboring houses to southwest.



Image 10: Area across the street from the house.

END OF REPORT

EXHIBIT A: City of Hudson, Codified Ordinances Appendix D. - Architectural Design Standards

To Nick Sugar, City Planner, City of Hudson
From Olivia Hopkins, AIA | Historic Architecture, Perspectus
CC: Lauren Pinney Burge, AIA, Principal | Historic Architecture, Perspectus

Section III-2. - Alterations to existing properties - all types.

The character of Hudson is preserved by maintaining the integrity of buildings as they are altered.

- a. *Alterations to non-historic buildings.* The following shall apply to all buildings which are not historic properties, as defined in Section III-2(b).
 - (1) In the case of an alteration to an existing property, an applicant must comply with the type design Standards in Part IV to the extent that they apply to the alteration itself.
 - (2) Applicants will be permitted to repair or replace existing non-conforming elements without bringing the element into conformance with the Standards, for example, shutters or windows may be replaced with essentially the same elements.
 - (3) If applicants propose to replace any element with another that is not the same (for example, aluminum windows for wood windows), the applicant will be required to conform fully with the Standards for those elements.
 - (4) Applicants may not be compelled to alter any part of the existing property which would otherwise not be affected by the proposed alteration.
 - (5) For existing buildings which do not conform to the type catalogue in Part IV, alterations will be allowed as long as they conform to the general principles enumerated in Section I-2, and they are compatible with the existing architectural style, materials, and massing of the building.
- b. *Standards for historic properties, all districts.* Historic properties include those buildings which are contributing to historic districts and buildings which are designated as historic landmarks by the City Council. Other buildings which have historic or architectural significance may also be reviewed as historic properties with the mutual agreement of the AHBR and the applicant.
 - (1) Historic landmarks or buildings within historic districts which are greater than fifty years old will not be reviewed according to the type Standards in Part IV. Such buildings will be reviewed according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation (see Appendix I) and National Park Service Preservation Briefs #14 and #16.
 - (2) In altering historic properties, the applicant is advised to refer to historic surveys and style guides which have been prepared specifically for Hudson, including the Uniform Architectural Criteria by Chambers & Chambers, 1977; Hudson: A Survey of History Buildings in an Ohio Town by Lois Newkirk, 1989; and Square Dealers, by Eldredge and Graham.
 - (3) Hudson's Historic District and Historic Landmarks contain a wealth of properties with well preserved and maintained high quality historic building materials. The preservation of these materials is essential to the distinguishing character of individual properties and of the district. Deteriorated materials shall be repaired where feasible rather than replaced. In the event that replacement is appropriate, the new material should be compatible in composition, design, color, and texture.
 - (i). Use of Substitute materials for Historic Properties (as defined in Section III-2. b.).
 - (a.) The AHBR shall review detailed documentation of the existing site conditions.
 - (b.) The AHBR shall request the patching and repair of existing materials.
 - (c.) If the repair or replacement of existing non-historic materials is requested, AHBR shall request removal of the non-historic material to expose the historic material so that it may be assessed.
 - (d.) If the AHBR concurs that the condition of the material requires replacement in some or all portions of the structure, like materials should be used. Substitute materials may be considered when the proposed materials do not alter the historic appearance of the structure, and the proposed materials are compatible in proportion, size, style, composition, design, color, and texture with the existing historic materials.
 - (ii). Use of Substitute materials for proposed additions to existing historic properties.
 - (a.) The placement of the addition shall be reviewed to determine its visibility from the public realm.
 - (b.) Substitute materials are acceptable provided they are compatible in proportion, size, style, composition, design, color, and texture with the existing historic materials.
 - (iii). New freestanding structures and non-historic properties: The use of substitute materials is acceptable provided they are compatible in proportion, size, style, composition, design, color, and texture of historic materials.
 - (iv). All applications are subject to Section II-1(c).

EXHIBIT B: Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

To Nick Sugar, City Planner, City of Hudson
From Olivia Hopkins, AIA | Historic Architecture, Perspectus
CC: Lauren Pinney Burge, AIA, Principal | Historic Architecture, Perspectus

The Standards (Department of Interior regulations, 36 CFR 67) pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy and encompass the exterior and the interior, related landscape features and the building's site and environment as well as attached, adjacent, or related new construction. The Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
6. 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.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. 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 and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. 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.