



City of Dayton

Landmark Commission

Meeting Case Record

February 12, 2026

1. Painting and new awning for approval - PLN2026-00008 – 10 N Williams St – A Major COA to to install a new black awning and paint the unpainted brick exterior of a non-contributing commercial building.

Applicant: Wright Dunbar Inc.
c/o Erica Hubler
1139 W Third St
Ste. 200
Dayton, OH 45402

Owner: Wright Dunbar Inc.
1139 W Third St
Ste. 200
Dayton, OH 45402

Priority Land Use Board: West

Planning District: Wolf Creek

Historic District: Wright-Dunbar

Decision: Continued

Case Presentation

Ms. Hornbeak presented the case. The request is to paint a partially painted non-contributing commercial building, and to install a new awning on the front of the building. Information on the history of the building was submitted. Condition photographs were submitted.

Neither the applicant nor a representative of the applicant was present to speak on the case.

Public Comments

No public comments.

Board Discussion

Mr. Johnson asked if there was going to be an issue covering the “POST OFFICE” stone sign over the entrance, with the awning. Ms. Hornbeak noted that, on a contributing building, that would likely be a concern. Ms. Konicki said that she found the building to be a good example of a building of its time, and that she had concerns that the type of brick that the façade is composed of would not take paint well. Mr. Gow said he has experienced a problem with paint adhering on a similar material at a different property. Ms. Hickey agreed that the building, even if it’s not contributing, is a building that has historic character. She also expressed concerns about painting the unpainted stone foundation and door surround. Ms. Konicki said that covering the “POST OFFICE” lettering with the awning was, to her, not a concern, as the sign would remain behind the awning and could be revealed in the future if desired.

Overall, there were questions and discussion points that would need to be addressed by the applicant.

Board Action

A motion was made by Ms. Hickey and seconded by Ms. Konicki to continue **PLN2026-00008 – 10 N Williams St**, so as to dicuss the proposal with the applciant in attendance.

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



City of Dayton

Landmark Commission

Page

Meeting Case Record February 12, 2026

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



City of Dayton

Landmark Commission

Page

Meeting Case Record February 12, 2026

2. Exterior siding for discussion - PLN2026-00020 – 2211 E Fifth St – A Concept Review to discuss installation of new siding

Applicant: Marvin Torres
701 Parkview Ave
Dayton, OH 45403

Owner: Marvin Torres
701 Parkview Ave
Dayton, OH 45403

Priority Land Use Board: Northeast
Historic District: Huffman

Planning District: Historic Inner East

Decision: N/A

Case Presentation

Ms. Hornbeak presented the case. The applicant has previously requested to keep the shortened windows on the home, and to install vinyl siding. These requests were denied. The current concept review is to discuss options for new siding on the exterior of the home. Information on the history of the home was submitted. Condition photographs were submitted.

Marvin Torres, the applicant, was present to speak on the case. Marcos Torres, the son of the applicant, was also present to discuss the case. Mr. Marvin Torres is a native Spanish speaker, and so Gianluis Ramos, of ProPio Language Services, was present at the behest of the city to provide translation services.

Ms. Hickey pointed out that one of the windows on the rear addition had apparently been infilled and noted that this would also need to be addressed. Mr. Holley asked if the applicant was planning on restoring the windows on the home that had been altered, and Mr. Marvin Torres stated that he did plan to do so, but that that project is taking time.

Regarding the siding, Mr. Marco and Mr. Marvin Torres both explained that the home had vinyl siding on it currently, and that they had removed vinyl and aluminum siding that was in bad shape. Their plan was to install new vinyl siding to match what remained on the home. Mr. Holley stated that, per the guidelines, they needed to go back with an original material, or a material that matches the original materials on the home. Ms. Hickey explained how a historic district comes to be, how a home with vinyl siding might be in a historic district, and how replacing that siding then had to be held to a higher standard.

Mr. Gow stated that even the vinyl siding that the applicant has left on the home and stated is in “good” condition will need to be replaced sooner rather than later. The lifespan of vinyl siding is 30-40 years, he explained, and this home has seemingly had its siding for over 50 years at this point. Replacing only some of the siding is a short-sited measure.

Mr. Holley explained that, at the meeting that was held January 15th, which the applicant did not attend, the Landmark Commission determined that the applicant needed to bring forward an application to install wooden siding on the home. Ms. Hickey pointed to other nearby homes where unoriginal siding had been removed and original siding had been restored or replicated. Mr. Gow asked what the condition of the siding on the home that was left was, and Mr. Marco Torres said that the vinyl that remained is in good shape, but that the original wood siding



City of Dayton

Landmark Commission

Page

Meeting Case Record February 12, 2026

underneath was rotten, and that there were water infiltration issues. Mr. Gow said that the siding was, as he said before, at the end of its lifespan, and that simply patching over would likely also not fully address the water issues.

Ms. Hickey and Mr. Gow both made the point that if the applicant invested in installing historically appropriate siding, the value of the home would increase, and they would have a bigger return on their investment through rent or resale.

Mr. Holley summed things up by saying the applicant should price out some wooden siding that would match the original and see if it's truly a prohibitively greater expense than fiber cement or vinyl siding. He noted that wooden siding with appropriate trim would be the best option, but if the applicant wishes to bring forward a case for a siding that adheres to the historic district guidelines, the Landmark Commission would be willing to hear such a case. Mr. Marvin Torres asked what alternative materials might be approved, and staff gave some options. A copy of the Blueprint for Rehabilitation was given to Mr. Marco Torres.

Public Comments

No public comments.

Board Discussion

The board's discussion took place during the case presentation and the discussion with the applicant.

Board Action

No board action was necessary, as this was a Concept Review.

Elizabeth Dakin, Secretary, Landmark Commission

Additional Staff Comments

Before the meeting adjourned, Ms. Hornbeak notified the Landmark Commission of a forthcoming demolition at 24 E First Street, which is a historic structure, but not a locally designated landmark. The demolition of the building will not need Landmark Commission approval, but its loss is still noteworthy. The building will likely need to be demolished as an emergency, but the nuisance abatement team has stated they plan to do what they can to salvage and reuse the historic terracotta façade.