City of Dayton
Landmark Commission
Meeting Case Record
January 14, 2020

1. Modification of doors for approval - Case # PLN2021-00563 – 357 Park Drive – A Major modification to remove two existing doors and install a new French door at the rear of the home.

Applicant: Mo Zahedi  
23 Clover St  
Dayton, OH 45410

Owner: Mo Zahedi  
23 Clover St  
Dayton, OH 45410

Priority Land Use Board: Downtown  
Planning District: South Park

Decision: Approved with Modifications

Case Presentation
Mrs. Hornbeak presented the case; continued from the December 10, 2020 hearing. The request is to remove two existing doors at the rear of the home. Additionally the applicant wishes to install a new set of French doors, measuring 72” wide by 80” tall. The rear wall containing the existing doors measures approximately 10’ wide, and the new French doors would be installed centered on this wall. Staff noted that the door would need an external grille, and that the door would probably need to be narrower. Condition photos were submitted. Product information was submitted.

Mo Zahedi, the applicant, and was present to answer any questions. Mr. Zahedi elaborated on his efforts to rehabilitate the building, and return it form a duplex to a single-family dwelling. He indicated that the existing doors are not original to the home. He clarified that the proposed door is in fact a single door with a full-sized sidelite, to give the appearance of a French door. He indicated that he has seen internal grids on windows on other properties in South Park.

Public Comments
No public comments.

Board Discussion
The Board discussed the request for the new door. The Board clarified that even if modifications are not visible to the street, they must still be done in accordance with guidelines and be historically appropriate. Mr. Holley explained that a single door would be the most historically accurate for the rear of the home. Mr. Zahedi indicated that he was open to suggestions by the Board. The Board clarified that 5’ to 5’-4” French doors would be acceptable. The board also clarified that internal grids are not acceptable in historic districts. Mr. Zahedi explained that the 72” door had already been ordered. Mr. Zahedi said he would agree to modify his application to remove one of the doors and allow the other to remain.

Board Action
A motion was made by Ms. Sebald and seconded by Mr. Gow to approve as modified Case PLN2020-00563 – 357 Park Drive. Modifications include:

1. The left hand door (as viewed from the exterior) will be toothed in with material to match existing wood siding.
2. The right hand door (as viewed from the exterior) will remain.
Mr. Gow  Yes  Ms. McNicholl  Yes
Mr. Heckman  Yes  Ms. Sebald  Yes
Mr. Johnson  Yes  Mr. Sliver  Absent
Ms. Maragano  Yes  Mr. Holley  Yes

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

2. Accessibility ramp for approval - Case # PLN2021-00003 – 44 McClure Street – A Major modification to install an aluminum accessibility ramp and to modify section of the walkway at the front of the home.

Applicant:  Myra Pineau
44 McClure St
Dayton, OH 45403

Owner:  Darryl Kinsler
1013 Taywood Rd
Englewood, OH 45322

Priority Land Use Board:  Northeast

Historic District:  St. Anne’s Hill

Planning District:  Historic Inner East

Decision:  Approved with Modifications

Case Presentation
Mrs. Hornbeak presented the case; a request to install a 3’ wide by 23’ long aluminum accessibility ramp at the front of the home. The ramp would lead to a 5’ x 5’ aluminum platform installed at the entry threshold. Additionally, a 48” section of concrete containing a single step on the existing walkway would be removed and replaced with a sloped section of concrete. Condition photos were submitted. Product information was submitted. The home does have rear alley access.

Myra Pineau, the applicant, and was present to answer any questions. Rear access was not an option for accessibility, as medical mobility vans would not be able to provide pick up from the alley.

Greg Reinhart, 97 North Glen Oak Drive, a home modification representative for the Montgomery County Board of Developmental Disabilities, was present to answer any questions. He provided clarification on the location of the ramp and the landing platform. The ramp needs to run along the length of the narrower section of the walkway, because it is not wide enough to provide accessibility. Aluminum was chosen as the material for cost reasons, as opposed to wood. He clarified that any modifications to the color of the ramp would need to be custom jobs.

Public Comments
No public comments.

Board Discussion
The Board discussed the request for the ramp and the landing. After clarifying the location and dimensions of the ramp, they discussed the size of the landing, determining that it would be more
appropriate for the landing to be slightly larger, and to align with the existing porch edge. It would also need at least 12” on the latch side of the door to meet ADA standards. It was also decided that it would be more appropriate to paint the railings on the ramp black.

**Board Action**
A motion was made by Ms. Sebald and seconded by Ms. Maragano to approve as modified Case PLN2021-00003 – 44 McClure Street. Modifications include:

1. Provide a minimum of 12-inches clearance for the cellar door accessed from the porch and align the new landing with the edge of the concrete porch.
2. Paint the ramp handrails black.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. McNicholl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Heckman</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ms. Sebald</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Johnson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. Sliver</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maragano</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. Holley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

3. **Patio roof covering for approval - Case # PLN2021-00005 – 122 Van Buren Street – A Major modification to construct a roof covering over an existing patio area.**

**Applicant:** Brian Weaver  
2440 Dayton-Xenia Rd  
Suite B  
Dayton, OH 45434  

**Owner:** Goldflies Storage + Moving Co.  
333 Wayne Avenue  
Dayton, OH 45410  

**Priority Land Use Board:** Downtown  
**Historic District:** Oregon  
**Planning District:** Oregon  
**Decision:** Approved as Submitted

---

**Case Presentation**
Mrs. Hornbeak presented the case; a request to install an approximately 600 sq. ft. roof covering over an existing patio area. The patio area and landscaping were previously installed with approval from the Landmark Commission. The building is considered non-contributing to the historic district. Condition photos were submitted. Architectural drawings and renderings were submitted.

Brian Weaver, the applicant, was present to answer any questions. He is the architect for this project. He explained that the patio covering is desired to provide expanded outdoor seating as required by the restaurant for social distancing measures. He also clarified the desire for the roof covering to be as unobtrusive as possible to the street scape and existing building.

**Public Comments**
No public comments.

Board Discussion
The Landmark Commission discussed the proposed roof covering. The board clarified that the dimensions of the roof are to be 32’ x 19’ 6”. Mr. Heckman asked about how storm water runoff was to be handled. Mr. Weaver explained that there is an existing catch basin near the patio, and gutters and downspouts would run excess water to that catch basin. Ms. Sebald asked if the underside was to be exposed. Mr. Weaver affirmed that it is to be exposed, with all wood painted a matte black. Ms. Maragano asked about the proposed roof color. Mr. Weaver explained that the proposed standing seam metal roof was going to be Galvalume, and the roof would be an aluminum color.

Board Action
A motion was made by Mr. Sebald and seconded by Mr. Heckman to approve as submitted Case PLN2021-00005 – 122 Van Buren Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Gow</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Ms. McNicholl</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Heckman</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ms. Sebald</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Johnson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. Sliver</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maragano</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mr. Holley</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

4. Glassblock basement windows for approval - Case # PLN2021-00004 – 113 McDaniel Street – A Major modification to install glass block in 4 basement windows. Two windows are located on the side of the home, and two are located at the front of the home.

Applicant: Patrick Flanik
113 McDaniel St
Dayton, OH 45405

Owner: Patrick and Abbey Flanik
113 McDaniel St
Dayton, OH 45405

Priority Land Use Board: North Central
Historic District: McPherson Town
Planning District: McPherson

Decision: Approved with Modifications

Case Presentation
Mrs. Hornbeak presented the case; a request to install glass block in 4 basement windows. Two of these windows are located along the side of the home, and two are located at the front of the home. The home is designated as the oldest building in the historic district. Conditions photos were submitted. Product information was submitted.

Patrick Flanik, the applicant, was present to answer questions. He explained that the house is currently being rehabilitated and explained that the glass block was requested for stability, insulation, and security reasons. He asked about alternatives to glass block that would provide for increased security.
Public Comments
No public comments.

Board Discussion
The Landmark Commission discussed the proposed glass block windows. Glass block windows are not allowed at the front of homes in historic districts. Other options for increasing the security of the windows were discussed. The Board commented that the windows appeared to be in decent condition and encouraged the repair of the windows. Ms. Sebald mentioned internal modifications to the windows, or to replace the existing glass with a laminated glass. Mr. Flanik asked if the depth of the window within the foundation could be modified, and the Board commented that this would be a historically inappropriate change. Mr. Holley suggested remounting the existing windows in new frames with laminated glass.

Board Action
A motion was made by Ms. Sebald and seconded by Mr. Gow to approve as modified Case PLN2021-00004 – 113 McDaniel Street. Modifications include:

1. The windows at the side of the home may be replaced with glass block
2. The windows at the front of the home are to be repaired to match existing, and may not be glass blocked

Mr. Gow Yes Ms. McNicholl Yes
Mr. Heckman Yes Ms. Sebald Yes
Mr. Johnson Yes Mr. Sliver Absent
Ms. Maragano Yes Mr. Holley Yes

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

5. Patio roof covering for approval - Case # PLN2021-00007 – 905 Wayne Avenue – A Major modification to construct a roof covering over an existing patio area.

Applicant: Brian Weaver
2440 Dayton-Xenia Rd
Suite B
Dayton, OH 45434
Owner: BBAA Holdings LLC
4441 Sweetgum Place
Dayton, OH 45424
Priority Land Use Board: Downtown
Historic District: South Park
Planning District: South Park
Decision: Approved as Submitted

Case Presentation
Mrs. Hornbeak presented the case; a request to install an approximately 540 sq. ft. roof covering over an existing patio area. The patio area and landscaping were previously installed with approval from the Landmark Commission. The building is considered non-contributing to the
historic district. Condition photos were submitted. Architectural drawings and renderings were submitted.

Brian Weaver, the applicant, was present to answer any questions. He is the architect for this project. He explained that the patio covering is desired to provide expanded outdoor seating as required by the restaurant for social distancing measures. He explained that storm water runoff will be handled by an existing catch basin that is located near the patio area, which would have a gutter and downspout leading to the existing catch basin. The standing seam metal roof is to be Galvalume and will be an aluminum color.

Public Comments
No public comments.

Board Discussion
The Landmark Commission discussed the proposed roof covering. Ms. Sebald asked if the proposed columns would be replacing the existing railing at the patio area. Mr. Weaver explained that the railing would remain as is, and the posts would be installed as closely to the railing as possible, with the goal of making the new roof covering look cohesive with the existing railing.

Board Action
A motion was made by Ms. Sebald and seconded by Mr. Heckman to approve as submitted Case PLN2021-000007 – 905 Wayne Avenue.

Mr. Gow    Yes    Ms. McNicholl
Mr. Heckman Yes    Ms. Sebald
Mr. Johnson Yes    Mr. Sliver
Ms. Maragano Yes    Mr. Holley

Approved by Landmark Commission (7 in favor, 0 opposed)
Abigail Free, Secretary, Landmark Commission
Case Presentation
Mrs. Hornbeak presented the case; a concept review of proposed modifications to the rear of the home. Submitted plans indicated the installation of ship lap siding at the front entries. The addition at the rear of the home, which is unoriginal to the building, would also be re-clad in ship lap siding. Product information was submitted for the ship lap siding. Product information was also provided on the proposed sliding glass door at the side of the rear addition. In accordance with guidance provided during the December 10, 2020 meeting, the proposal to install clerestory windows at the rear was modified. Submitted elevations show three new garden box windows at the rear of the home, as well as two new skylights in the rear addition roof. Product information was submitted for the garden box windows. Product information and a location was also submitted for a proposed fence. The proposed fence would be a 6’ high wooden privacy fence with horizontal boards. Staff clarified that the two smaller garden windows would measure 40” wide by 48” tall, and the larger garden window would measure 60” wide by 48” tall. Condition photos were submitted.

Casey Nikole, the applicant, was present to answer any questions. The applicant explained that the proposal to re-clad part of the front of the home in ship lap siding was done out of a desire to have the modifications to the cladding at the rear of the home be cohesive with the existing building. Ms. Nikole also indicated that the rear addition currently has issues with mold, which is why the ship lap is desired. Ms. Nikole also explained that the garden windows at the rear were desired as part of her kitchen plans.

Public Comments
No public comments.

Board Discussion
The Landmark Commission discussed the proposed modifications. The Board asked for the information from the Blueprint for Rehabilitation regarding garden windows. Garden style windows, that project form the wall and have a sloped top, are allowed on side and rear elevation per the Blueprint for Rehabilitation. Ms. Sebald said that more product information should be provided for the proposed garden windows. Mr. Holley requested information on how far from the wall the proposed garden windows would project. Mr. Holley also questioned why the building was shown in drawings as brick instead of stucco. Ms. Nikole was not sure why the architect had done the drawings in this manner. Mr. Sebald discussed EFIS materials that could be used on the rear of the home and indicated that the ship lap at the rear would be acceptable, but that the ship lap at the front of the home would not be approved nor appropriate. The Board
asked for clarification on the height of the new windows and the height of the new sliding glass window. The applicant verified that the height of the garden windows would match the existing window openings, and Ms. Sebald indicated that a transom above the sliding glass door would help provide consistency between the height of the new door and the windows. The Board indicated that the sliding glass door would be acceptable, as it is a modification to a non-contributing addition. The fence would be a minor modification, but the Board suggested that a vertical-board fence would be more appropriate. Ms. Free explained that the proposed fence location and height might need to be adjusted per zoning requirements.

Summary of modifications:
1. Remove ship lap siding form front façade of home
2. Ship lap siding at rear is acceptable
3. Add a transom above the sliding glass door
4. Clarification that new skylights need to be low-profile, not bubble-style
5. Fence location should be reviewed with Zoning, a vertical board fence is more appropriate

Abigail Free, Secretary, Landmark Commission