



City of Dayton

Landmark Commission

Meeting Case Record April 30, 2026

1. Construction of a new porch for approval - PLN2026-00099 – 113 Centre St – A Major Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new porch on the home, which will replace the existing unoriginal porch.

Applicant: Historic Huffman Homes II LLC
c/o Rebecca Howard
109 Centre St
Dayton, OH 45403

Owner: Historic Huffman Homes II LLC
109 Centre St
Dayton, OH 45403

Priority Land Use Board: Northeast **Planning District:** Historic Inner East

Historic District: Huffman

Decision: Approved with Modifications

Case Presentation

Ms. Hornbeak presented the case. The request is to remove an unoriginal aluminum porch awning and metal posts and construct a new porch. Condition photographs and construction drawings were submitted. Context images showing other homes and porches in the district were submitted. Ms. Hornbeak mentioned that the applicant would like to use fish scale siding on the gable end and also noted that she was not sure if the new porch would require a railing.

Mr. Holley noted that the submitted photograph of the salvaged porch post looks like it had some damage or rot at the ends. Ms. Hornbeak hoped that the posts could be repaired and explained that the applicant was working with Jeff Wysong (of Dayton Reclamation and Restoration). Mr. Gow noted that Jeff Wysong is a capable professional, and that he should be able to find quality salvaged posts, or repair damaged ones. Ms. Konicki asked if the porch foundation was going to be altered, and staff confirmed that the foundation and steps to grade were to remain as is.

Public Comments

No public comments.

Board Discussion

The Landmark Commission found the proposed porch to be acceptable. Ms. McNicholl commented, and other board members agreed, that the proposed fish scale siding in the gable would be fine.

Board Action

A motion was made by Ms. Hickey and seconded by Mr. Heckman to approve **PLN2026-00099 – 113 Centre St** with the following modifications:

1. Fish scale siding in the gable end is appropriate.
2. If the new porch requires a railing, those details to be submitted to staff for final review and approval.

Mr. Gow	Yes	Ms. McNicholl	Yes
Mr. Heckman	Yes	Ms. Hickey	Yes
Mr. Johnson	Yes	Mr. Holley	Yes



City of Dayton

Landmark Commission

Meeting Case Record

April 30, 2026

Page

Ms. Konicki

Yes

Approved by Landmark Commission (7 in favor, 0 opposed)

Elizabeth Dakin, Secretary, Landmark Commission



City of Dayton

Landmark Commission

Meeting Case Record

April 30, 2026

Page

2. Exterior modifications for review - PLN2026-00100 – 401 E Fifth Street – A Concept
Review to discuss the addition of several windows on the exterior of the property, the options for re-stuccoing the exterior, and for the restoration of first floor storefronts on southern façade.

Applicant: Moody Nolan Architects
c/o Jay Boone
300 Spruce St, Ste 300
Columbus, OH 43215

Owner: MATA Properties
7462 Carrick Ter
Boca Raton, FL 33433

Priority Land Use Board: Downtown

Planning District: Oregon

Historic District: Oregon

Decision: N/A

Case Presentation

Ms. Hornbeak presented the case. The request is to review proposed changes to the exterior of the building, which would include re-stuccoing, the addition of several new windows, restoration of the front storefronts and the creation of a new rear entrance, and the installation of new canopies at the front and rear entrances. Condition photographs and information on the history of the building was submitted. Proposed plans and elevations were submitted. Product information on the new stucco was submitted. There was a brief discussion about what windows were being replaced to match, and which windows were in new or altered window openings. Mr. Gow asked if the building originally had a stucco exterior, and staff confirmed that it had, per the newspaper articles from when the building was first constructed.

John Dedrick, representing the Charles F. Kettering Foundation (200 Commons Rd, Dayton OH 45459), was present to speak on the case. He gave a brief overview on the history and mission of the Kettering Foundation and explained that the foundation is currently considering moving their headquarters back to the city of Dayton.

Jay Boone, from Moody Nolan Architects, was also present to speak on the case. Mr. Boone went over the provided floorplans and elevations and talked about the future use of the building. He explained that the biggest concern in converting the building to an office space is getting more natural light into the building, which is very difficult with the current window layout. He also talked about the history of the building, and how the addition of floors to the building after its original construction has resulted in windows set at very strange heights, and in some cases being cut off by the ceiling. Finally, he explained that the new windows are all the same width of existing windows, and on the top floors would keep the existing head height.

David Meleca, also of Moody Nolan Architects, was also present to speak on the proposal. Mr. Meleca talked briefly about the history of the building, noting that it was never finished to the original design. He also talked about the windows, noting that the new windows align with the windows on the front façade, which is the most “finished” side of the building. Mr. Meleca provided an example of the window that will be used, which is an aluminum frame and would have simulated divided lites (exterior applied muntins). Mr. Meleca also had samples of the



City of Dayton

Landmark Commission

Page

Meeting Case Record April 30, 2026

stucco material to be used on the outside. Mr. Meleca talked about the issues with the floor plates and the window heights and commented that he goal is to make the Pine street façade look more “presentable”.

Mr. Gow asked about the new stucco. Mr. Meleca explained that it would just be a new parge coating over the existing surface, to smooth it out and make it more consistent and uniform. They had hoped to see a brick surface under the stucco but said that it is actually a concrete building. There was a conversation about the color and finish of the stucco.

Mr. Johnson asked about signage for the building. Mr. Meleca said that they would have signage, but that they would need to come back with that proposal.

Public Comments

No public comments.

Board Discussion

Mr. Gow said he was “over the moon” about the proposal, saying it looked in keeping with the original designs that were published in the newspaper. Mr. Heckman agreed that the plans are definitely an improvement to the building but did want to note that the stair towers in the original plans were apparently planned to have smaller punched windows. He later clarified that he didn’t think it was a reason to not approve the new glass in the stair towers but thought it should be noted that it’s a change.

Mr. Johnson had questions about the entrances and use of the building. Mr. Gow asked about the proposed awning. Mr. Meleca explained that the existing awning is in very poor condition and is a cloth awning. The new proposal would use a metal awning, something more substantial, like what is seen in the older newspaper photographs and drawings. Mr. Heckman said that the proposal looks like what the building was meant to look like all along. Speaking about the Pien Street façade specially, he said that it’s an aggressive change, but that the proposal looks like a building from the 1920s. Ms. Hickey agreed that it’s in keeping with the period of construction, and Ms. Konicki noted that the exiting façade looks very “utilitarian”, and what is proposed looks more like a street-facing façade, which this is. Ms. Konicki really liked the plans for the employee entrance at the rear off the parking lot.

There was a brief discussion about the move of the Kettering Foundation back to Dayton.

Mr. Holley noted that it was indeed a radical change to the building, but that given what is known about the history of the building, it’s impossible to know what the original design or intention was. Ms. Hickey agreed that they don’t know what the full realization of the building would have been if the project had been completed and thought that the proposal was in keeping with the era of the building. Mr. Gow asked about the signage plan. Mr. Boone said it would likely be the last component of the proposal. Mr. Dedrick commented that the signage plan would come at a later date, and that it would adhere to the historic district guidelines and the



City of Dayton

Landmark Commission

Meeting Case Record

April 30, 2026

Page

character of Fifth Street. Mr. Holley told the applicant that final color decisions for the stucco could be approve administratively by staff. He thought that the stucco finish should have a bit more texture, like what you would typically see on a Spanish revival building.

Larry James, also of the Kettering Foundation, gave a final statement, noting the dysfunction with the existing windows, and how it just doesn't work with the plans for the building. Ms. Hornbeak confirmed that statement, saying she had seen the issues with the floor plates and the windows, and the lack of natural light in person during a tour of the building.

Overall, reaction to the proposal was overwhelmingly positive.

Board Action

No board action was necessary.

Elizabeth Dakin, Secretary, Landmark Commission



City of Dayton

Landmark Commission

Meeting Case Record

April 30, 2026

Page

3. New of the Blueprint for Rehabilitation for review - PLN2026-00056 – A Work Session to review the first section of the new edition of the Blueprint for Rehabilitation (Introduction – Structural Elements).

Applicant: City of Dayton
c/o Holly Hornbeak
101 W. Third St.
Dayton, Ohio 45402

Owner: N/A

Priority Land Use Board: N/A

Planning District: N/A

Historic District: N/A

Decision: N/A

Case Presentation

Ms. Hornbeak presented the Blueprint for Rehabilitation updates and spoke briefly on the proposal overall and then more specifically on the updated standards individually. Photographs and illustrations are new, as is any text presented in red.

Public Comments

No public comments.

Board Discussion

Mr. Heckman thought the roof section should have a cross-reference to the rules on skylights. There was a brief discussion on solar panels, and a cross reference to that section of the book can also be included in the section on roofs.

Ms. Konicki brought up some issues with the wording of the standards under chimneys. There was a discussion about how to phrase information on the removal of chimneys, something that allows for the removal of chimneys occasionally, but that does not encourage people to seek their removal. Mr. Gow asked if there was anything in the guidelines that talks about economic difficulties when it comes to preservation projects. Staff said there is not, and the usually economic difficulties can really only be considered when they render a project “unfeasible”, that is, something is so expensive or difficult to source that no one could afford to do the work. Slate roofs were cited as an example of when a replacement in kind become “unfeasible”.

Speaking of slate roof, Mr. Holey through the roofs section should have a standard that talks about the lifespan of slate roofs. Ms. McNicholl also noted that the standard on the layers of asphalt shingles can be removed, as that is something that is governed by the building code. Ms. Hornbeak asked for feedback on standard 1 under roofs, which talks about aluminum and rolled roofing. Ultimately, the standard needs to be heavily reworked, to be more specific about what exactly is prohibited (stamped roofing that imitates a different material) and clarify when rubber membrane and rolled roofing is appropriate (low slope or flat roofs).



City of Dayton

Landmark Commission

Page

Meeting Case Record April 30, 2026

Mr. Gow and Mr. Johnson brought up the references included in the current edition of the Blueprint. Staff did note they had been removed but could be re-added. Mr. Gow also wanted to see more references to the Secretary for the Interior Standards and Preservation Briefs.

There was a brief discussion of adding more style information to the new construction section. Mr. Gow asked about how much leeway the Landmark Commission has, and Ms. Hornbeak said that it's up to the Landmark Commission to use their discretion on when leeway can be permitted, relying on the standards and their own experience in preservation and construction. Ms. Hickey asked about translating the document, and Ms. Hornbeak confirmed that as soon as the new edition is finalized, it will be translated by the city's translation services.

Board Action

No board action was necessary. Each section will be reviewed and edited, and the document will be finally approved as one document after all edits have been made.

Elizabeth Dakin, Secretary, Landmark Commission



City of Dayton

Landmark Commission

Meeting Case Record April 30, 2026

4. Discussion of upcoming BZA case – A brief discussion of the upcoming Board of Zoning Appeals case for the appeal of PLN2026-00002 (108 Green Street). The Landmark Commission decided to formally request legal representation of their position at the hearing.

Case Presentation

Ms. Dakin discussed the upcoming appeal of PLN2026-0002 with the Landmark Commission. She noted that the Landmark Commission is entitled to have a legal representative at the meeting. City of Dayton lawyer Greg Parker was prepared to represent the Landmark Commission perspective at that meeting, if requested. The board would need to formally make that request.

Public Comments

No public comments.

Board Discussion

The Board discussed idea, weather or not legal representation was necessary. Mr. Holley noted that the decision can only be overturned if the Landmarks Commission erred procedurally, and staff confirmed that. Mr. Heckman and Ms. Hickey said there was really no reason to not make such a request. Mr. Gow said it seems like their decisions are always overturned at the BZA.

Board Action

A motion was made by Ms. Konicki and seconded by Ms. Hickey to formally request legal representation at the hearing for **PLN2026-00108 – 108 Green St.**

Mr. Gow	Yes	Ms. McNicholl	Yes
Mr. Heckman	Yes	Ms. Hickey	Yes
Mr. Johnson	Yes	Mr. Holley	Yes
Ms. Konicki	Yes		

Approved by Landmark Commission (7 in favor, 0 opposed)
Elizabeth Dakin, Secretary, Landmark Commission