



# 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, April 22, 2026

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:** 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

**Absent:** 1 - 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:** 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

**Absent:** 1 - Ms. Manko

**[AHBR 26-234](#) 67 Division Street (Historic District)**

Alteration (Roof Replacement)

**Attachments:** [67 Division St - AHBR Packet](#)

This AHBR agenda item was approved on the Consent Agenda.

**[AHBR 26-263](#) 30 Ravenna Street**

Sign (Ground and Wall Sign)

Attachments: [30 Ravenna Street - AHBR Packet](#)

This AHBR agenda item was approved on the Consent Agenda.

## V. Old Business

[AHBR  
2025-1478](#)

### **88 N Main Street (Historic District)**

Alterations (Door Replacement)

Attachments: [88 N. Main Street - Letter to AHBR](#)  
[88 N Main Street - Proposed Door Photos](#)  
[88 N Main St - AHBR Packet 3.11.2026](#)

Ms. Coffman opened the discussion by reviewing the previous meeting comments and referencing the applicant's letter to the Board.

Mr. Joseph Kernan, counsel for the applicant, explained that during the earlier AHBR review, the applicant was asked to add detailing to the door so it would better align with other doors along the street. After reviewing the surrounding properties and photographing nearby storefronts, Mr. Kernan noted that many of the adjacent businesses, including both neighboring properties, use metal-frame doors like the one at 88 N. Main Street. The distinguishing feature on those doors is the etched glass displaying the business name. He proposed adding a similar etching to the door in question while otherwise keeping it unchanged.

The Board, the applicant, and staff noted the applicant's proposed wood door replacement has been withdrawn after he determined the current door is consistent with several others on the block. Mr. Kernan questioned why other businesses on Main Street were permitted metal doors. The Board asked staff whether those other doors were formally permitted. Mr. Kernan also raised the historical example of The Gap, questioning why its door was allowed at that time.

Board members responded that they did not have information regarding why certain doors were approved in the past, but emphasized that the current application could not be approved without a formal plan. They also reiterated the importance of preserving the historic character of Main Street. Mr. Kernan expressed concern that his client was not being treated in a fair and impartial manner that is consistent with neighboring businesses. The Board noted that differences in architectural context may play a role and also clarified that enforcement of prior approvals is beyond its authority.

Following an extended discussion about the apparent inconsistencies in past door approvals, the Board reiterated that it could not act without a submitted plan.

Ms. Marzulla moved, and Mr. Workley seconded, to enter executive session. The Board

approved the motion unanimously.

The Board returned from executive session at 7:50 p.m.

After the Board decision, Mr. Kernan thanked the Board for its time and stated his belief that the application had not received equal protection under the law, noting that the applicant would consider its next steps.

**A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, stating that because the first component of this application included signage, the Board intends to remain consistent with its comments from February 11, 2026, regarding approval of the signage. With respect to the second part of the application concerning the door, the Board moves to DENY the request under Section 2.1, Approval and Discretion of the AHBR, based on the applicant not meeting the required criteria for exceptional design. The Board found that the proposal does not demonstrate creativity, is not responsive to a unique situation involving site difficulty or unusual program requirements, and does not present an exceptional or unique condition that would create practical difficulty in complying with the standards. These factors are considered as defined in the Land Development Code for determining practical difficulty.**

**The motion to DENY was approved by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

**Absent:** 1 - Ms. Manko

## VI. New Business

### [AHBR 26-197](#) 6492 Elmercrest Dr

Alteration (Applied Stone & Siding)

**Attachments:** [6492 Elmercrest Dr - AHBR Packet](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying photos of the structure and reviewing the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Bob Zickenfoose and Mr. Dominic Andrews of Hometown Roofing and Construction responded to the staff comments by distributing written responses to the Board and then walking through each item. They explained that wrapping the stone around the back of the house would add an additional \$5,000 to \$6,000 in cost for an area that would not be visible. They also clarified that vertical siding is proposed for the front elevation. In addition, they stated that all existing brick on the front of the house would be replaced with stone, and noted that the current brick does not terminate at an inside corner.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed several points, including the fact that the chimney is gray brick and the stone course would wrap around it. The applicant explained that the Infinity Stone material cannot be installed on the three-season room due to weight limitations. The Board expressed concern about the stone not wrapping fully around the structure and

questioned whether it should extend to the sunroom. It was noted that a privacy fence would make the sunroom largely not visible from view. The discussion also included clarification that the proposed product is a siding material rather than real stone, consideration of placing the stone only on the front elevation, and the importance of not creating new non-compliant conditions. The Board also explored whether lowering the height of the stone on the side elevations could help reduce costs for the homeowner, and acknowledged that unique existing conditions affect the project.

**Recognizing that unique existing conditions exist at this house, a motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Kenney, to grant an exception and approve the AHBR application as amended, with the following conditions: The brick material on the right side will be matched, and the new stone will wrap around the corner to the chimney. The motion was approved by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

**Absent:** 1 - Ms. Manko

### [AHBR 26-262](#) **85 Division Street (Historic District)**

Accessory Structure (Pergola)

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

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying elevations of the proposed pergola and reviewing the staff comments.

Mr. Perry Demming, the applicant, explained that the structure will be wrapped in Azek material designed to resemble wood, and presented photographs illustrating the intended appearance of the pergola.

Mr. Ryan Coffman of Coffman Lawn Company added that both the aluminum components and the Azek material are maintenance-free.

The Board, the applicant, and staff discussed several points, including that Azek has been approved in other projects within the Historic District, and that the photographs show the aluminum elements of the structure will not be visible once wrapped in Azek. It was noted that the top of the pergola is aluminum and that a color more compatible with the surrounding neighborhood would be preferred for that exposed portion. Discussion also addressed the fact that Azek is not used elsewhere on the house, and that the overall appearance of the pergola is more modern than the historic character of the home and nearby outdoor structures. The Board acknowledged that the pergola has a slatted roof that will visually blend into the yard. It was also noted that Azek offers a post-wrap product suitable for this type of installation, and that the garage features a black metal roof.

**A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Sredinski, that this AHBR Application be approved as amended, with Azek wrap and a black or dark tone moveable roof. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

**Absent:** 1 - Ms. Manko

### [AHBR 26-259](#) **1597 Hines Hill Rd**

**Accessory Structure (Carriage House)**

**Attachments:** [1597 Hines Hill Rd - AHBR Packet 4.22.2026](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application and reviewed the staff comments and recommendations.

Mr. Leon Sampat, LS Architects, noted that the north elevation will have additional windows, the low-hung windows will be casement, and all the materials will match the existing materials. Mr. Sampat also noted that the architect who did the previous work is attempting to find the spec sheets used before.

**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:** 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

**Absent:** 1 - Ms. Manko

**[AHBR 25-554](#) 670 Terex Rd****Addition (Living Room, Kitchen, & Garage)**

**Attachments:** [670 Terex Rd - AHBR Packet 4.22.2026](#)  
[670 Terex Rd - AHBR Packet 10.8.2025](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying the elevations, describing the project, and noting revised elevations where submitted following the informal review on October 8, 2025, and reviewed the staff comments.

Mr. Andrew Heilmair, and William Heilmair, applicants, stated that the entire structure will receive a new metal roof, and reviewed the rest of the staff comments with their comments.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed the column not going to the roof, the door not centered under the overhang - which are drawing mistakes, and the siding material.

**Mr. Workley made a motion, seconded by Ms. Kenney, to approve with the following conditions: Modify the left elevation where brick is required, the foundation material changed to brick to match the existing foundation, and any other modification submitted to staff. The motion was approved by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

**Absent:** 1 - Ms. Manko

**[AHBR 26-101](#) 200 Laurel Lake Dr****New House (Villas)**

**Attachments:** [200 Laurel Lake Dr - Villas - AHBR Packet](#)  
[200 Laurel Lake Dr - Villa Staff Comments](#)

Ms. Coffman stated that Laurel Lake has requested that the application be tabled.

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

**Aye:** 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 1 - Ms. Manko

**VII. Other Business**

[AHBR 22-730 Findings of Fact](#) Architectural and Historic Board of Review Findings of Fact for case #22-730 for the property located at 5530 Stonecreek Way, Hudson, OH 44236

Attachments: [AHBR Decision - 5530 Stonecreek Way](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Workley, seconded by Ms. Marzulla, that these Finding of Facts be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 1 - Ms. Manko

[AHBR 3.11.2026](#) Minutes of Previous Architectural & Historic Board of Review Meeting: March 11, 2026

Attachments: [March 11, 2026 AHBR Meeting Minutes - Draft](#)

A quorum of members who were at this meeting were not present; a vote could not be conducted.

**VIII. Staff Update**

A meeting with HHA and potential Landmark Home owners was noted to take place on April 29, 2026.

A meeting of AHBR, BZBA, and Planning Commission was noted to take place on April 27, 2026.

This matter was discussed

**IX. Adjournment**

A motion was made by Ms. Marzulla, seconded by Mr. Workley, that the meeting be adjourned at 8:44 p.m.. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Mr. Caputo, Ms. Kenney, Ms. Marzulla, Mr. Workley, Ms. Sredinski and Mr. Brown

Absent: 1 - Ms. Manko

\_\_\_\_\_  
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.*

\* \* \*