



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT • 1140 Terex Road • Hudson, Ohio 44236 • (330) 342-1790

ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC BOARD OF REVIEW

CASE NO. 2025-1478 COMMERCIAL SIGN AND ENTRYWAY DOORS – PERMIT #25-1478 88 N. MAIN STREET

FINAL DECISION

Applicant Joseph Kernan submitted a hanging sign and exterior door replacement permit for the property located at 88 N Main Street after City Staff identified exterior alterations had been made without a permit. The changes include:

1. Replacement of an existing projecting (hanging) sign.
2. Replacement of a side entry door.
3. Replacement of a front entry door.

Based on the evidence presented by the applicant, Joseph Kernan, the property owners, and city staff at the Architectural and Historic Board of Review meeting held on February 11, 2026 and continued to the April 22, 2026 meeting, the Architectural and Historic Board of Review approves items #1 and #2 but denies item #3 for case #25-1478, 88 N Main Street (Parcel #3201390).

The Architectural and Historic Board of Review makes the following Findings of Fact:

The building is located within the Historic District and was constructed in 1892. Therefore, is subject to the following design standards as stipulated in Section III-2(b)(1) of the Architectural Designs Standards:

- Section III-1- General Standards for all buildings
- Section II-2 – Alterations to existing properties – all types
- The Secretary of Interior Standards for Historic Rehabilitation (Appendix I)
- National Park Service Preservation Briefs #14 and #16
- Part V: Design Standards for Signs

Item #1 – Projecting (Hanging) Sign: The Board finds the proposed sign complies with the Architectural Design Standards requirements for projecting signs within the Historic District, specifically, Section V-1(b) stating *“Storefronts with common architectural elements should have signs that share continuity of design so that the placement and design of individual signs contribute to the cohesive appearance created by the common architectural elements. For example, a series of storefronts that, because of their architecture and design, have the appearance of a single building should have occupant signs that share common elements.”* The board finds that the proposed sign would be constructed of a compatible material and would be consistent and compliant with this requirement.

Item #2 – Replacement Side Door: The Board finds the proposed replacement side entry door complies with the Architectural Design Standards, specifically Appendix-1(9) relating to new additions and exterior alterations, which state that *“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.”* The Board finds that the proposed door is located on an interior side elevation within an existing alley and is not visible from the public realm or Main Street. The Board further finds the proposed wider trim detail and traditional details are compatible with the traditional design of surrounding historic features and consistent with the character of the Historic District.

Items #3 – Replacement Front Door:

1. The Board finds the following:
 - a. The building is over 50 years old, is contributing the National Register Historic District, and is applicable for review according to the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and National Park Service Preservation Briefs #14 and #16.
 - b. The Board finds the proposed front entry door is located on the front elevation facing the public realm and North Main Street corridor, making compatibility with the surrounding historic district of great importance.
 - c. Section III-2(b)(3)(i) states *“the AHBR shall review detailed documentation of existing conditions”*. The AHBR finds pre-existing door was replaced without an opportunity to assess the condition. Review of photo documentation confirms the pre-existing door was not historic; however, did contain traditional window Lites, hardware and trim
 - d. Section III-2(b)(3)(i)(d) states *“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”*. The AHBR finds the proposed aluminum frame door containing no divided lites and modern handle design alter the historic appearance of the building and are not compatible in proportion, size, style, composition, design, color, and texture with the existing historic materials.
 - e. The proposed front entry door does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation criteria #2 stating *“The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved”*. The contemporary design is not compatible with the 1892 building’s overall architecture. The full glass door is designed with a narrow metal frame and contemporary handle.
 - f. The Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation criteria #6 and Preservation Brief #16 states *“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”*. While the Board acknowledges the previous front door was not historic, the Board finds the applicant has not sufficiently documented the existing materials of the door prior to replacement or retained elements of its design that were appropriate for the

historic district, including a traditional design with wider frame and window divides.

- g. Preservation Brief #16 states *“When it is necessary to replace a less distinctive, secondary feature that is less important in defining the historic character of the property, there is more flexibility in how it can be replaced. While it may be less important to find an exact match in materials when replacing such a feature, the retention of the overall historic character should still guide selection of an appropriate replacement material.”* The Board finds the replacement door would not retain the overall historic character of the building and North Main Street.
- h. The applicant has identified example doors on North Main Street and stated they have a similar design to their proposed front entryway door. The Board finds the following:
- 80 N Main Street: The front entry door is not visible from Main Street and there is no permit record on file.
 - 98 N Main Street: The current front entry doors were approved in 2021 and the board acknowledges that previous metal front entry doors were approved by the AHBR in 1998. The Board found the existing metal storefront door and window design have been in place dating back to occupancy of the Gap (1998 – 2015) and further back to the Hudson Post Office (Pre-1998) prior to the establishment of the Land Development Code. The proposal was for a like-for-like replacement.
 - 134-136 N Main Street: There is no permit record on file and photo documentation finds the door design has been in place for at least (approximately) 20 years.
 - 160 N Main Street: There is no permit record on file and photo documentation finds the door design has been in place for at least (approximately) 20 years.
 - 164 N Main Street: There is no permit record on file and photo documentation finds the door design has been in place for at least (approximately) 20 years.
 - 214 N Main Street: The front door was approved in 1998, prior to the establishment of the Land Development Code.

Furthermore, the AHBR does not find an exception pursuant to the review criteria established in Section II-1. The AHBR finds that the proposal is not of an exceptional design, meaning it is not especially creative nor is it designed in response to a unique situation, such as a very difficult site or an unusual program requirement.

No exceptional or unusual conditions exist that are not common to other areas similarly situated and there is no resulting practical difficulty (as defined in the LDC per Section II-1(c)(2) based on the following findings:

1. The property in question will yield a reasonable return and there can be beneficial use of the property without the variance. The applicant can propose and install a historically compatible front entry door or modify the existing door that meets the design standards.
2. The variance is substantial, as the Architectural and Historic Board of Review has been consistent in administering and interpreting proposals for historically compatible and appropriate alterations. Approving the exception would create a precedent without merit.
2. The essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered and the adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance.

Maintaining the character of historic Main Street is imperative to the City of Hudson.

3. The variance would not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services such as water and sewer.
4. The owner purchased the property in 2017. The requirements were in place at this time.
5. The applicant's predicament can be obviated feasibly through adjustments to the proposed door. The applicant could modify the existing door to meet the requirements subject to final AHBR review and approval.
6. The spirit and intent behind the requirement would not be observed and substantial justice would not be done by granting the exception.

Dated: _____

CITY OF HUDSON ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC BOARD OF REVIEW

John Caputo, Chair