



# City of Dayton

## Landmark Commission

### Meeting Case Record

September 28, 2023

#### **1. Replacement of slate roof and box gutters for approval - Case # PLN2023-00292 – 1406**

**W Third Street** – A Major COA to replace an existing slate roof, and install a dimensional asphalt shingle roof, paint an unpainted cinderblock rear addition, and replace existing box gutters with standard gutters at 1406 E Third Street, within the Huffman historic district.

**Applicant:** Sibaja Contractors  
43 Notre Dame Ave  
Dayton, OH 45404

**Owner:** Charlie Samaan  
1406 E 3<sup>rd</sup> St  
Dayton, OH 45403

**Priority Land Use Board:** Northeast

**Planning District:** Historic Inner East

**Historic District:** Huffman

**Decision:** Approved with Modifications

---

#### **Case Presentation**

Ms. Dakin presented the case. The request is to replace the existing deteriorated slate roof and box gutters, and to paint an unpainted cinderblock addition at the rear of the home. Material information for two new roof shingles were submitted. Condition photographs were submitted.

Charlie Samaan (255 N Main St. Dayton, OH 45402), the owner, was present to answer any questions. Mr. Samaan explained that the property is a residence, and that the rear cinderblock addition is not currently occupied. Mr. Holley asked about the soffits if the box gutters are to be removed. Mr. Samaan deferred to his contractor, Mr. Hernandez, who was also present. Mr. Samaan stated that he planned to retain and reuse (and replace to match if necessary) the existing metal ridge caps and decorative finials on the roof.

Charles Hernandez, representing Sibaja Contractors, was also present to speak on the case. Mr. Hernandez spoke generally to the reconstruction of the overhang when the box gutters were removed, but there were no drawing or details about what that new condition would look like. Ms. Sebald said that a section detail would likely be needed to explain what the new condition would look like. Mr. Hernandez confirmed that the plan is to recreate the existing slope and curve on the edge of the roof with the new roof.

#### **Public Comments**

No public comments.

#### **Board Discussion**

The Board discussed the proposal. Given that the rear cinderblock addition is a non-contributing addition, the Landmark Commission was okay with it being painted. Additionally, the replacement of the existing slate roof seemed acceptable, given the condition and age of the existing roof. Ms. Sebald did note the decorative banding present in the shingle pattern on the front two slopes of the roof.

Mr. Gow talked about the processes of relining box gutters and stated that it would likely be the same amount of work to replace the box gutters as it would be to reline and reuse them. Mr. Samaan asked if they could replace missing downspouts, and the Landmark Commission stated that they certainly could. Mr. Holley and Mr. Heckman agreed that removing the box gutters



# City of Dayton

## Landmark Commission

### Meeting Case Record September 28, 2023

and installing standard aluminum gutters would look strange. Ms. Sebald also had concerns about what exactly would be removed if the box gutters were eliminated.

Mr. Heckman told Mr. Samaan that the Landmark Commission would likely want to see the box gutters restored. Mr. Samaan agreed to this condition and said that if he for some reason about not restore the box gutters, he would return with more information.

#### Board Action

A motion was made by Ms. Sebald and seconded by Mr. Gow to approve **PLN2023-00292 – 1406 W Third Street** with modifications. Modifications include:

1. The replacement shingle is to be the Mystique Antique Slate dimensional shingle.
2. The box gutters are to be repaired or replaced to match existing; downspouts can be added.

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

Approved by Landmark Commission (6 in favor, 0 opposed)  
Elizabeth Dakin, Secretary, Landmark Commission



# City of Dayton

## Landmark Commission

### Meeting Case Record

September 28, 2023

**2. Case # PLN2023-00335 – 144 Henry Street** – A Major COA to construct a new 483 sq. ft. addition to the rear of the existing home. Addition will contain a new bedroom and a sunroom, and the submitted plans also include a new wooden deck at the rear entrance. Information on doors and windows has been provided.

**Applicant:** Elaine and Ericson Rosca  
42 High St  
Dayton, OH 45403

**Owner:** Elaine and Ericson Rosca  
42 High St  
Dayton, OH 45403

**Priority Land Use Board:** Northeast

**Planning District:** Historic Inner East

**Historic District:** St. Anne's Hill

**Decision:** Approved with Modifications

---

#### Case Presentation

Ms. Hornbeak presented the case. The request is to construct an addition on the rear of the existing home. Plans and elevations were submitted. Specifications on proposed doors and windows were submitted. Photographs of the property were submitted.

Elaine Rosca, the owner, was present to answer any questions. Ms. Rosca noted that her preference as presented in the meeting was for option "B" (the single slider flanked by two windows), but that she had seen the 4-wide sliding French doors and thought it would be another viable option (presented in the meeting as option "A"). She stated that both options were around the same cost.

#### Public Comments

There were no public comments.

#### Board Discussion

The Board discussed the addition. They overall agreed that much had been improved from the previous submission and stated that the awning windows were more appropriate than the previously shown transoms.

Ms. Sebald noted that this is, as staff said, an addition to an addition, and won't really impact the historic integrity of the existing home. She also noted that the 4-wide door was different than a "typical suburban" slider door. The Commission also noted that the door would have no visibility.

#### Board Action

A motion was made by Ms. Sebald and seconded by Mr. Heckman to approve **PLN2023-00335 – 144 Henry Street** with modifications. Modifications include:

1. The 4-wide double sliding door shown in the meeting is to be used on the rear elevation.
2. The two awning windows on the right elevation may be ganged together or separated with a thick mullion.



# City of Dayton

## Landmark Commission

### Meeting Case Record September 28, 2023

In making the motion, Ms. Sebald noted the reasoning for approval for the 4-wide door as being that the door is different than a suburban style slider door, that it will have no visibility, and that it will not be installed in or otherwise affect a historic addition.

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

Approved by Landmark Commission (6 in favor, 0 opposed)  
Elizabeth Dakin, Secretary, Landmark Commission



# City of Dayton

## Landmark Commission

### Meeting Case Record

September 28, 2023

**3. Case # PLN2023-00336 – 136 S Dutoit Street** – A Concept Review to discuss a proposal to construct a new garage at 136 S Dutoit street. Proposed garage would be built against existing carriage house, so as to provide access from carriage house to garage without having to alter existing window and door openings.

**Applicant:** Anthony Turrentine  
36 S June St  
Dayton, OH 45403

**Owner:** Bossler Mansion LLC  
136 S Dutoit St  
Dayton, OH 45403

**Priority Land Use Board:** Northeast

**Planning District:** Historic Inner East

**Historic District:** St. Anne's Hill

**Decision:** Approved with Modifications

**Modifications:** Comments Given/ No Action

---

#### Case Presentation

Ms. Dakin presented the case. The request is to reviews plans to construct a new garage, abutting the existing carriage house. Information on the history of the carriage house and property were submitted. Sketches of the proposal were submitted. Ms. Hornbeak noted that the case would have to also go to the Board of Zoning Appeals for approval, for the size of the accessory structures on this property.

Anthony Turrentine, the applicant, was present to answer any questions. Mr. Turrentine confirmed that the plan is to abut the new garage up against the existing carriage house. He explained that the existing carriage house is actually two ADUs (Accessory dwelling units) and does not currently provide any enclosed parking. The owner of the property, he stated, would like to have covered parking.

When asked why the new garage had to butt up against the existing carriage house, and what the fire separation would look like, Mr. Turrentine explained that the location shown for the garage made the most sense with the existing site layout. The owner and he didn't want to negatively impact the existing trees/ landscaping elements. He also explained that the new garage and the carriage house would have fire separation between the two walls.

When asked about the door and window on eh carriage house, that would be affected by the new garage, Mr. Turrentine stated that he planned to infill the window, and relocate the window to the gable of the new garage. He also stated that the carriage house door opening would be bricked in.

#### Public Comments

There were no public comments.

#### Board Discussion

The Board discussed the proposed garage. The fact that the garage would abut the existing carriage house, changing the overall form of the carriage house, and that the proposal would involve covering an existing door and removing an existing window, did not seem appropriate. They discussed alternative options and stated that the construction of a new garage would likely be permissible, but it should be separate from the carriage house. If a variance was needed to



# City of Dayton

## Landmark Commission

Page 6

### Meeting Case Record September 28, 2023

locate the new garage elsewhere on the property, the Landmark Commission stated they could give support for such a variance if it is required to provide distance from the carriage house and the new garage.

#### **Board Action**

Comments given; no action required.

Elizabeth Dakin, Secretary, Landmark Commission