

**MINUTES OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING
CITY OF KENNESAW
Council Chambers
(2529 J.O. Stephenson Avenue, Kennesaw, GA 30144)
February 21, 2025
8:00 AM**

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chairman Gallagher called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

Roll Call: Rachel Butler, Andrew Bramlett, Kevin Whipple, Sharon Blandford

Staff Present: Chanelle Campbell (Assistant Zoning Administrator & City Planner) and Rebecca Goldstein (Community Development Administrative Assistant)

Speakers Present: Kevin Lares (Applicant), Orlando Orochena (Property Owner/Applicant), Andrew Mackey (Property Owner/ Applicant), Elliot Van Dyke (Applicant), David Shelton (Property Owner/Applicant), and Jennifer Dickey (Project Coordinator).

Absent: Darryl Simmons (Planning & Zoning Administrator)

2. Approval of the Meeting Minutes

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes: January 17, 2024

Chairman Gallagher called for a motion.

Motion to approve the meeting minutes by Commissioner Bramlett.

Seconded by Vice Chair Whipple.

Chairman Gallagher proceeded with a roll call vote for approval of the meeting minutes.

Vote taken, motion unanimously approved 4-0. Motion carried.

3. Financial Report

Ms. Chanelle Campbell introduced the financial report. As of January 2025, there were no new expenses. The balance remains at \$23,398.00 for collected assets for use by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). The balance has remained the same since the previous month's financial report. Ms. Campbell notified the HPC that additional funds are always available for the board to attend trainings and conferences.

Chairman Gallagher called for a motion.

Motion to approve the financial report by Vice Chair Whipple.

Seconded by Commissioner Blandford.

Chairman Gallagher proceeded with a roll call vote for approval of the financial report.

Vote taken, motion unanimously approved 4-0. Motion carried.

4. Old Business

A. **Exterior Renovation (Alteration): 2908 Moon Station Rd**

Consideration of approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness application

submitted by Kevin Lares for Arturo Paella Wine & Tapas Restaurant for an alteration of the historic structure located at 2908 Moon Station Rd. Said alterations include a new roof, repairing and adding new siding, installing new gutters, constructing a pergola and adding landscaping. Case #COA2025-01

Ms. Chanelle Campbell introduced this agenda item. This is a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by Kevin Lares for the historic property located at 2908 Moon Station Road. This request was heard by the board on January 17th and the applicant has submitted revised plans based on the comments received at the previous meeting. The applicant is requesting to complete alterations to the historic structure, which includes a new roof, repairs and additions to the siding, and the construction of a pergola. On January 17th, the application was approved with the following conditions: 1. The applicant will return to the HPC with detailed plan specifications of exterior materials for the siding and roof, and added lighting fixtures for review and approval; 2. The chimneys will be designed and reconstructed to the existing form, function, shape, and mass to the building line with final review and approval by the HPC; 3. The pergola will be redesigned and reestablished to be a free-standing structure to the building, and the materials used for the pergola will be presented to the HPC for review and approval; 4. The applicant will return with a detailed landscaping plan for any site improvements; 5. The applicant will coordinate with and return to the Building Services department with a plan and detailed specifications to shore and brace the building to retain structural stability and prevent further damage to the structure in the interim as the final plans for the foundation and exterior renovations are completed.

During the last meeting, there were some issues with the potential integrity of the building that required immediate response to secure the structure. The applicant has since obtained a building permit for footing repairs to stabilize the foundation of the structure. Ms. Campbell does not believe work has started, but stated the applicant would be available to answer any questions and provide updates on the status of the permit. Mr. Lares has returned to the HPC seeking approval for the revisions made to the plan.

Vice Chair Whipple requested that Mr. Kevin Lares (Applicant and Contractor) explain the modifications made to the plans. Mr. Lares stated that all comments from the HPC were addressed. Corrections were notated on the building plans and elevations, which were submitted to the HPC. Mr. Lares used the pergola as an example, stating that the plans now detail that the pergola will be detached and constructed with pressure-treated, fire-retardant wood. Additional notations were made to indicate that the carriage lights will be similar to existing fixtures. The roof and siding will also be similar to existing materials. The only HPC requested item missing is a landscaping plan. The owner has not yet decided on a final landscaping plan.

Chairman Gallagher asked if the stop work order on the project had been lifted. Mr. Lares responded that the stop work order has not yet been lifted. Mr. Lares also noted that work on the footings had not yet begun due to weather obstacles. Mr. Lares expects work to commence the following week to pour concrete for the footings,

pending improved weather. Chairman Gallagher asked what steps would be taken once work on the footings is complete. Mr. Lares responded that once work to stabilize the foundation was completed and inspections passed, they would return to the building department to work on obtaining a building permit for the structure. Ms. Campbell stated that Mr. Lares' explanation was correct. She further stated that HPC approval was required for Mr. Lares to obtain a building permit and continue work on the internal and external portions of the structure. Commissioner Butler asked if Scott Banks (Building Official) approved the permit for work on the footings. Ms. Campbell responded that only permits for the footings were approved. The applicant is thus only permitted to stabilize the structure; no additional work can move forward until the HPC approves the plans.

Chairman Gallagher asked if materials have been sourced for the project to match the existing materials. Mr. Lares responded that he had not yet sourced materials. He stated he knew where the materials would be purchased from, but contracts have not been signed with suppliers.

Chairman Gallagher commented that restoring the chimneys was of immediate concern. He asked if the owner was intending on reconstructing the chimneys. Mr. Lares responded that the chimneys were on the plans and would be rebuilt in the same shape.

Commissioner Bramlett asked if the pergola would be a finished wood or painted to match the house. Mr. Lares responded that the pergola would be painted, pressure-treated wood. He stated the paint color would likely be a shade of brown to complement the surrounding environment.

Vice Chair Whipple stated that it appeared the applicant met the HPC's stipulations from the last meeting regarding the exterior materials, the pergola, the brick chimneys, and the lights. The only item that has not been met is the landscaping plan, which is still in progress.

Commissioner Blandford asked if the arch at the front entrance was still part of the project. Mr. Lares responded that the arch was still part of the project. Commissioner Blandford referenced the Historic District Design Standards for the applicant, including section 7.2.05 "The application of details that do not belong to the period or style of the house is not permitted," and section 7.3.07, "The addition of materials or architectural details not appropriate to the period or style of the house is not permitted ." She stated that the arch on the plans is not within the period of the house.

Chairman Gallagher commented that the board appeared in agreement that the applicant met the HPC's stipulations of the previous meeting and requirements for additional submissions. He stated that there appears to be adequate information to advance the application and allow the applicant to start sourcing materials and continue restoration work.

Mr. Lares stated that page A 4.0 of the plans shows the arch removed. Vice Chair Whipple stated that the arch was on the rendering. He asked if the arch was on the building elevation. Mr. Lares stated that the arch was not on the building elevations.

Chairman Gallagher called for a motion.

Motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application by Commissioner Bramlett with the following conditions:

1. The arched arbor showed on sheet A.0.0 will not be part of the project, contingent upon sections 7.2.05 and 7.3.07 of Historic District Design Standards;
2. All previous conditions for approval placed on this property by the Historic Preservation Commission will continue to apply;
3. The applicant will return to the Historic Preservation Commission with a submitted landscaping plan.

Seconded by Commissioner Blandford.

Chairman Gallagher proceeded with a roll call vote for approval with conditions. Vote taken, motion unanimously approved 4-0. Motion carried.

Ms. Campbell clarified that Mr. Lares would now be allowed to apply for building permits.

B. Exterior Renovation (Alteration): 2981 North Main Street

Consideration of approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by Orlando Orochena for an alteration of the historic structure located at 2981 North Main Street. Said alteration includes the addition of two dormers to the roof and the removal of the two unsafe chimneys for an attic renovation. Case # COA2025-02

Ms. Chanelle Campbell presented this agenda item. This is a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by Orlando Orochena for the alteration of the historic structure located at 2981 North Main Street. This request was heard by the HPC on January 17th. The applicant has submitted revised plans based on the comments received at the previous meeting. At the last meeting, the board voted to table the request to allow the applicant to investigate an alternative location and size for the dormers and alternatives to the chimney removal, and reiterate on the plans that the porch would remain intact. The revised application proposes adding dormers of the same size and style currently on the house. The applicant has also included a letter from a Certified Engineer with details regarding the chimney.

Mr. Orochena stated that the board's considerations were taken into account for this iteration of the design. The new design includes the addition of dormers on the sides of the house that replicate the dormer currently on the front of the house. A picture of the rear of the house was submitted, showing inadequate space to place two dormers. A letter from an engineer was also submitted detailing the condition and concerns about the chimneys. Mr. Orochena stated that they are willing to rebuild the chimneys on the top of the house in a brick color that matches the existing chimneys.

Chairman Gallagher commented that it appeared that the size and scale of proposed

dormers had been reduced and that the roof line on the front dormer is being carried through to the other dormers. One of the concerns was the windows in the dormers, which have been reduced from large double windows to a smaller single window. He stated that a primary concern would be the chimneys because they are a defining feature of the Georgian Cottage style in Kennesaw. Chairman Gallagher further commented that he appreciates the inclusion of the chimneys in the revision. He stated that rebuilding or stabilizing the chimneys or the exterior of the chimneys would be an appropriate consideration. Mr. Orochena responded that they were willing to rebuild the exterior of the chimneys and match the bricks to the existing.

Commissioner Bramlett commented that section 7.8.05 of the Historic District Design Standards states that the design of a new addition is to be clearly differentiated so the addition is not mistaken for part of the original building. Other parts of the standards require renovations to look similar to the existing building. He asked fellow commissioners how they thought the sections applied to the case. Mr. Orochena commented that they are flexible as to what material will be used on the dormers. He stated that Hardie Plank siding was presented as the dormer material in the previous meeting, but he changed the material to concrete siding to match the existing material on the house based on the HPC's comments. Commissioner Butler asked what material is on the existing dormer. Mr. Orochena responded that the material is concrete siding. Commissioner Butler commented that a shake material might be appropriate, but asked the commissioners for their comments on the material. Vice Chair Whipple commented that choosing a materials that does not look out of place while abiding by the differentiated requirement in the Design Standards has always been a challenge. Mr. Orochena commented that other houses on the street use dormer material that matches the siding on the rest of the structure. He expressed that using a different material on the dormers might make the structure look out of place. Chairman Gallagher stated that at the previous meeting, the HPC came to the conclusion that this project was not an addition to the building footprint, but rather, an additional architectural feature. There is a provision in the guidelines that allows for the siding on the dormers to match the existing material on the house. He expressed that he thought a similar material would be permissible as long as the color and width of the siding were consistent with the structure. Vice Chair Whipple referenced Section 7.5.06 for new dormers, which states, "these new features must be compatible with the period, style, and details of the historic building." He concluded that the guidelines warrant matching the historic details of the existing building.

Vice Chair Whipple commented the chimneys will need to remain in some form or fashion, whether restructured internally or reappointed. He stated that the chimneys are character-defining elements to this style of house. Mr. Orochena asked if they were able to rebuild new chimneys. Vice Chair Whipple responded that Section 7.5.06 talks about chimney replacement and states, "Chimney repair and replacement must match the existing mortar, brick color, size and texture." Vice Chair Whipple stated that it would be preferable for the applicant to reuse portions of the bricks that are visible above the roofline. Vice Chair Whipple stated that the Commission realized that based on the photos of the brick, the ability to salvage materials would be difficult. Mr.

Orochena responded that he was not sure how many of the bricks could be salvaged because they are in bad shape. Vice Chair Whipple stated that sometimes the bricks are put in wet and the bricks will degrade as soon as they are touched. Mr. Orochena stated that if any of the bricks are touched, they fall apart.

Ms. Campbell asked the board to consider reviewing the plans for the chimneys to ensure the details are accurate and will match with the construction. Currently, staff only possess renderings of the chimneys. Chairman Gallagher stated that he thought it was important to make sure the height of the chimneys matches the current size, form, and function. Mr. Orochena stated they plan to make the chimneys the same height as they are currently. Vice Chair Whipple stated that the chimneys would be non-operable. Mr. Orochena stated that the chimneys are already non-operable and have not been used since they have lived in the house. He added that they will rebuild the chimneys to the same height with the same color brick and mortar. He asked the HPC what he would need to submit for the chimneys. Chairman Gallagher responded that the applicant should submit an elevation to show the existing height and reconstructed height to match, and if you cannot salvage the existing bricks, a color scheme. Mr. Orochena stated that he brought a sample of the brick color provided by the contractor if the HPC wanted to review it. Vice Chair Gallagher recommended the applicant submit a one-page sketch of the existing chimney height above the roofline to Planning and Zoning, who could then get the submission to the chairperson for an administrative review. Vice Chair Whipple added that he did not wish to hold up the applicant with another HPC meeting. Mr. Orochena clarified that only a sketch from the contractor would be required.

Chairman Gallagher called for a motion.

Motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application as submitted and amended by Vice Chair Whipple with the following conditions:

1. Section 7.5.08 and 7.5.09 shall be followed regarding the chimney replacement and repair;
2. Section 7.5.06 shall be followed regarding the additional dormers, requiring the dormers to be constructed in like-kind to the existing dormer to match the historic nature of the house;
3. An exhibit and photo documentation of the existing chimney above the roof line, along with details for the proposed chimney (height, width, material) shall be submitted to the City and Chairperson for administrative review of the chimney replacement.

Seconded by Commissioner Blandford.

Chairman Gallagher proceeded with a roll call vote for approval with conditions. Vote taken, motion unanimously approved 4-0. Motion carried.

5. New Business

A. Addition: 2982 North Main Street

Consideration of approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by Andrew Mackey for an addition to the existing house located at 2982 N. Main Street. Case #COA2025-04

Vice Chair Whipple and Commissioner Butler recused themselves from this agenda

item.

Ms. Chanelle Campbell presented this agenda item. This is a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by Andrew Mackey for an addition to the historic structure located at 2982 North Main Street. The structure currently sits on 0.47 +/- acres and is listed on the Historic Registry. On December 20th, the Certificate of Appropriateness application for a two-story addition to the structure was denied due to concerns about the size and scale of the addition in relation to the historic structure. The applicant has submitted a new application with revised plans and is seeking approval for the addition.

Mr. Andrew Mackey (Applicant/ Homeowner) stated revised plans have been submitted to construct an addition.

Chairman Gallagher asked the applicant to walk through the changes that had been made from previous plans. Mr. Mackey responded that his understanding from the last meeting was that the addition on the old plans dwarfed the existing structure. With the new plans, they have tried to minimize the size of the addition by adjusting the roofline and matching the new dormer on the rear of the house with the existing dormer on the front of the house. Chairman Gallagher asked if the overall height of the new roofline had changed. Mr. Mackey responded that the new roofline had been changed significantly from the last plan.

Chairman Gallagher asked if a long one-story addition to the back of the structure instead of a vertical two-story addition had been explored. Mr. Mackey responded that the addition is two and a half feet in length. Ms. Butler explained they reduced the height of the addition to minimize the commission's concerns that the addition would dwarf the historic building, but retained enough height to allow the Mackeys to do what they wanted with their residence. They tried to reduce the height by slightly sloping the roof towards the back while also trying to retain the vernacular at the front and sides of the house. She stated that they looked at one-story addition options, but it would require the rotation and replacement of lines and utilities. Because of that, a one-story addition was not feasible.

Mr. Mackey stated that they faced several challenges with the house, including a valley in the roof that causes damage to the foundation when it rains. By creating a ridge in the middle of the roof with the addition, water is diverted to the sides of the house. The yard also slopes up four and a half feet. Building a long one-story addition would not be feasible without a four-foot step inside the addition or a retaining wall around the entire structure.

Mr. Kevin Whipple on behalf of CSC Design explained that the previous proposal was a true two-story addition being attached to the additional residence where there was concern with the mass of a true two-story attached to this single story on the front. In this version of the plans, they have gone back with a single story with a raised attic with a bonus room in the attic, which reduces the massing from the two-story volume. Mr. Whipple presented the 3-D rendering of the house and addition, stating that it

provides a better understanding of the addition, the existing roofline, and the garage in the rear. In the previous presentation, the height of the addition aligned with the height of the garage. In this iteration, they tried to keep the scale of the house at a single story to relate to adjacent properties. He also showed images of the roof valley in the rear of the house, reiterating how the roof condition dumped water into the foundation during rain events and explained the intent to roof over the valley section with a slightly larger gable. Mr. Whipple stated that the design maintained the existing roof slope for the addition and showed images of the elevations. He explained that the additional will not look as tall from the street and that the gable in the rear of the house will not be visible from the street.

Mr. Whipple stated that the siding material on the addition would be board and batten siding to address comments about the addition being materially differentiated from the original historic structure. The roofline will attempt to stay low and respond well to the existing historic house. Mr. Whipple stated that Ms. Bulter and Mr. Mackey put multiple iterations into the design to try and find the best way to minimize the impact visually.

Chairman Gallagher commented that he appreciated the details. He recognized the reduction in the mass of the roofline. He commented that he is concerned with the visual of the roofline from the street given the gabled winged cottage style of the historic structure. He stated that other additions to structures on Main Street have maintained the roofline and include a long one-story addition on the back of the structure. He appreciated the applicant's challenging landscaping and utility connections with making a one-story addition that stretches along the back of the property, but noted that there has to be a balance between constructability and maintaining the integrity of the historic structure from the aesthetic side of the street. Commissioner Bramlett agreed and stated that allowing the addition as proposed would set a big precedent. He asked if there was anything like the proposal in the neighborhood. Mr. Mackey stated that a house three doors down from him had a similar addition. He stated that he has a picture from the 1950s showing a neighboring house on Main Street with an appearance similar to his current home. He further stated that the added that they built a ridge between the gables and built up a second story into the gables. Commissioner Bramlett asked if the house he was referring to was the blue house on 2996 North Main Street. Mr. Mackey confirmed. He stated that house had been significantly altered in the same way he is proposing to alter his property, but he did not know if it could be taken into consideration for his property. He commented that his family would like to stay in the house. He hoped the HPC would take into consideration that his wife is four months pregnant and that he thought the plan would be approved in January. He stated that he did not have another alternative if the proposal was not approved. He offered to submit the old picture of the adjacent house as evidence that a similar addition was added in the neighborhood. Commissioner Bramlett expressed concern that the addition to 2996 North Main Street was not approved by the HPC. Chairman Gallagher asked Ms. Campbell if staff had any historic information from any previous HPC considerations of other houses in the area that may have had additions.

Ms. Campbell did not have the information available. She assumed that the property owner would have gone through a similar process to be reviewed by a board. Commissioner Bramlett asked if Ms. Campbell knew when the addition would have been approved. Ms. Campbell responded that the addition had not come before the HPC during her employment with the City. Mr. Mackey stated that the addition was an older addition. He stated that they were trying to make the house look cohesive with the neighborhood, garage, and existing style of the house, but noted that there were limits to what they can do with the property.

Commissioner Blandford asked the applicant if having additional research into the timing of changes, building permits, and historic preservation approvals for the house at 2996 North Main Street would be helpful. Commissioner Gallagher asked the applicant if the design team did any research on previous work down on structures on Main Street. Mr. Mackey responded no. Ms. Butler responded that they did not research other houses. Ms. Butler observed the old photo of the house at 2996 North Main Street and noted that it looked to be taken in the 1950s. She commented that the house had different vernaculars compared to its present state. Commissioner Blandford commented that the Board felt the applicant's frustration, but commented that it was important for the board to see some precedent with the changes to the other property at 2996 North Main Street. She stated that she would be interested in knowing the record of those changes.

Chairman Gallagher commented that raising the addition of the house and adding the roofline on Mr. Mackey's house would make it incompatible with immediately adjacent properties. He stated that the property to the right of Mr. Mackey's house has an addition to the back with a roofline that matches the front elevation. Mr. Mackey asked where in the HPC guidelines it stated that the adjacent property has to be similar. Chairman Gallagher responded that the guidelines cover the feel of the whole neighborhood and specifically address the roofline, mass, and scale of the proposal. He summarized that the HPC would like to see some additional information on the historic work done on the referenced adjacent house with a similar style. He stated the board did not want to set new precedent.

Mr. Mackey asked what the implications would be if the addition to 2996 North Main Street was done outside of HPC approval. Commissioner Gallagher responded that the proposal for Mr. Mackey's house would need to be considered within the HPC guidelines. He stated that the addition to the other house may have been done prior to the establishment of the guidelines.

Ms. Campbell suggested that the HPC table the agenda item while staff researched the adjacent property Mr. Mackey mentioned. She asked if Mr. Mackey would agree to the item being tabled for further research. Mr. Mackey agreed.

Chairman Gallagher called for a motion.

Motion to table this agenda item until March 21, 2025, by Commissioner Bramlett.

Seconded by Commissioner Blandford.

Chairman Gallagher proceeded with a roll call vote. Vote taken, motion to table approved 2-0. Motion to table carried.

Mr. Mackey asked for further guidance from the HPC on how to go about designing the addition. He expressed frustration that after working with an HPC member to design the project, he still has not gotten approval. He stated that he is now backed into a corner with an incoming newborn his family does not have room for. Chairman Gallagher stated he appreciates the applicant's frustration. He stated the biggest issue is the height of the building. Ms. Campbell stated that Planning and Zoning staff will sit down with Mr. Mackey to discuss some suggestions and alternatives for the proposed request.

B. Central Business District: 2615 & 2681 South Main Street

Consideration to review a Central Business District (CBD) project application to construct a mixed-use development consisting of multi-family apartments and 2,500 sq. ft. of retail located at 2615 & 2681 South Main Street (Parcel # 20016700140 & 20016700990). Case #CBD2025-01

Ms. Campbell introduced this agenda item. This is a Central Business District project application submitted by Highpoint Acquisitions, LLC, for the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of multi-family apartments and 5,000 sq ft of retail at 2615 and 2681 South Main Street. The agenda stated 2,500 sq. ft. of retail, but the commercial space has increased since the agenda was published. This comprehensive development aims to create a vibrant, walkable community that seamlessly integrates residential, retail, and recreational spaces, enhancing the overall appeal and connectivity. Although the property is not in the Historic District, as part of the CBD project process, the application requires review and approval from the Kennesaw Downtown Development Authority (KDDA), the Historic Preservation Commission, and the Mayor and Council. The KDDA reviewed the application last Friday and the project was unanimously approved. The application will be heard by Mayor and Council in March. The applicant has a presentation and will be available to answer any questions for the board.

Mr. Elliot Van Dyke (Applicant) introduced himself, noting that he had previously appeared before the HPC for The Lacy, Phase I of the project. He commented that he would likely need to appear before the board with more finalized plans, including a landscaping plan. Mr. Van Dyke presented items from Phase 1 to refresh the board's memory on what they did, how it turned out, and the aesthetic of Phase 1 because Phase 2 will largely be similar in quality and exterior materials. Phase 1 included a 44-unit for-sale townhome component, two multi-family buildings with retail space on the ground floor of one of the multifamily buildings, a shared parking deck, a retail out-parcel, and parking spaces. He stated that red brick was used on the building facades to complement existing historic structures located downtown. The design for the interiors took inspiration from The Lacy, a historic hotel that was located in Kennesaw.

Mr. Van Dyke began the presentation for Phase 2 with a map showing the location of the Phase 2 relative to Phase 1 and the rest of downtown. He stated that a mobile home park and auto wrecker were currently located on the site and would be demolished to construct Phase 2. The site for Phase 2 consists of approximately 7 acres and is the smallest lot size feasible for the project. A number of challenges for the site were mentioned, including the need to add a parking deck to meeting parking requirements, the need to build a basement level to maintain the grade with the site's bowl-shape topography, the need to pursue higher densities to make up for high land costs, and the need to not build on a portion of the property due to a creek running through the front of the site. The project will involve piping the portion of the creek on the site and connecting it to the piped portion of the creek on Phase 1.

Mr. Van Dyke stated that the project will have a linear park in the front consisting of approximately 2.5 acres, a 3,000 square foot stand-alone restaurant, 2,500 square feet of ground floor commercial in one of the multifamily buildings, 8,000 square feet for fitness and club area, a parking deck, and a dog park. They also intend to include pedestrian connectivity between Phase 1 and Phase 2. After working with Planning and Zoning and Public Works, they are proposing signaled crosswalks with raised medians. Mr. Van Dyke mentioned that the raised medians would improve pedestrian safety and described the design of the medians including the intent to use brick pavers or stamped concrete and vegetation that does not block site lines. They also intend to shrink the lane size. They believe the signaled crosswalks with raised medians and shrinking the lane size will provide traffic-calming. Mr. Van Dyke also stated the project will introduce a new sidewalk to boost connectivity between The Lacy and Sardis Street. They will install 5-foot wide sidewalks that will go up to 6-feet wide in some places.

Mr. Van Dyke then reviewed inspiration images for the project. The first image showed inspiration for the stand-alone restaurant. They intend to provide an atrium between the restaurant and the neighboring building on the site. Other images were shown as inspiration for the color scheme. For the project the first three stories will be a lighter brick and the fourth story will be a recessed, darker siding component.

Mr. Van Dyke reviewed the renderings for the project, showing the intent for a lighter brick and darker cementitious siding component. The rendering also showed the location of the linear park, restaurant space, club area, and the leasing area. They intend to put the buildings along the street frontage and hide the parking in the rear to create a more subtle project.

Mr. Van Dyke then reviewed the property elevations. They have included balcony elements above the first floor and awnings on the first floor to make the building look mixed-use. They also created an area on the top floor for a premium unit.

Chairman Gallagher sought to clarify that the presentation was a conceptual plan for the property. Ms. Campbell confirmed that the presentation was conceptual. She reiterated that the applicant stated the concept was at around 20% completion. She explained that in the past, applicants have returned to the HPC with more details

pertaining to the exterior of the project, which will be the case for this applicant. Ms. Campbell stated that the presentation was conceptual and the proposal will also go before Mayor and Council for review.

Commissioner Butler recalled that the Phase 1 of the project was not part of the historic district. She asked if this property is historic. Ms. Campbell responded that the property is not historic.

Chairman Gallagher commented that from the renderings and sketches, the buildings are very linear and flat without any relief or subtly. He observed that in Phase 1, there was differentiation in the color schemes and relief throughout vertically and horizontally within the façade. He stated that the Phase 1 façade appeals to the Commission. He requested that the applicant try to provide some differentiation and breaks in the façade. Mr. Van Dyke asked if Chairman Gallagher preferred the breaks. Chairman Gallagher responded in the affirmative.

Vice Chair Whipple commented that building B in the proposal is set back from the sidewalk by the extension of gateway park and provides relief from South Main. He stated that building E is directly against the sidewalk and looks flat and plain. He complemented the applicant on their work giving the The Lacy a downtown feel, but mentioned that the project was significantly set back from South Main. He reiterated that the design felt cold and stark and expressed concerns that the design would not be perceived as pedestrian friendly at the retail level. He commented that the applicant might develop the area with more detail including how the retail would interact with the hardscape and streetscape.

Mr. Van Dyke responded that there is limited space to fit buildings on the site and that there is insufficient room to set the building back due to challenging topography. He stated they could look at breaking up the massing. He also stated that there would be a decel lane in front of the building that would push the building back by twelve to fifteen feet. Vice Chair Whipple explained that his comment was not about the placement of the building in relation to South Main. Rather, he was concerned that the building appears very stark along the sidewalk without awnings, an arcade, or other forms of relief. Mr. Van Dyke responded that they were trying to starkly differentiate Phase 2 from Phase 1. They would prefer not to create the same massing and red brick elements that stick out and lighter brick elements that invert in. They were trying to create a more linear office feel instead of the residential look of Phase 1. He stated that they could break up the massing more and expressed his hopes for an open back and forth dialogue. He expressed that they liked the light brick to contrast with Phase 1 but could easily accomplish breaking up the massing. Vice Chair Whipple stated that the concern was not the color scheme. He referenced the precedent photos presented by the applicant and stated that those images had a more articulated, softer retail level the provided some relief along the street. Mr. Van Dyke referenced an inspiration photo with strong linear elements with some periodic breaks with red brick in between. Commissioner Bramlett commented that he like the appearance of the darker red brick in the inspiration photo.

Mr. Van Dyke asked if splitting the long linear massing in half with one recess would be an improvement. Commissioner Bramlett responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Bramlett asked what consideration has been given to the cemetery neighboring the property. Mr. Van Dyke stated that considerations for the cemetery included surveying efforts to make sure unmarked cemetery uses were not on the site. They also had physical inspections and surveyors on the site to delineate the cemetery property. Commissioner Bramlett stated that he believed that there was a section in the Code of Ordinances mandating a 50 foot buffer from the nearest grave. Vice Chair Whipple showed Commissioner Bramlett where on the site plan the distance from the cemetery was marked. Commissioner Bramlett confirmed he saw the distance between the proposal and the cemetery.

Mr. Van Dayke asked if the distance requirement was different for structures and parking lots in the Code, explaining that there was parking up against the cemetery but the building was offset from the cemetery. Commissioner Bramlett stated that he thought there was a cemetery section in the Code. Ms. Campbell stated that the proposal was conceptual and that the official site plan will be reviewed by Public Works and Planning and Zoning to ensure all setbacks are adhered to before approval. She stated that this review was for the concept and exterior.

Chairman Gallagher summarized that the HPC understands the concept and agreed that there should be some addition review and a final landscaping plan that would make it appropriate for the applicant to come back to HPC for consideration as the project progresses.

Commissioner Butler commented that she did not appreciate the townhome design for Phase 1. She stated that the townhomes are close to historic buildings and are a three-story tower in comparison to the existing homes. Commissioner Butler stated that she asked for a section cut from the residential house to the residential side of your three-story buildings and that it was never brought before the Board. She expressed frustration that the buildings were so close, and while she understood the landscaping challenges of the site, she was disappointed that the section cut never came before the Board.

Vice Chair Whipple asked if Phase 2 abutted any residential properties. Mr. Van Dyke responded that they were abutted by industrial to the south and Karate studio to the north.

Chairman Gallagher called for a motion.

Motion to approve the CBD project application by Vice Chair Whipple with the following condition:

1. Applicant will present additional drawings to the Historic Preservation Commission at 80 percent, including landscaping plans, exterior building elevations with material identifications, and updated renderings reflecting material updates.

Seconded by Commissioner Blandford

Chairman Gallagher proceeded with a roll call vote for approval with conditions. Vote

taken, Motion unanimously approved 4-0. Motion carried.

Mr. Van Dyke asked how the updates would be submitted. Ms. Campbell responded that staff would place the project on agendas and send the documents out for review as required.

C. Landscaping: 2966 North Main Street

Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by David Shelton for the replacement of a trident maple tree with a dogwood tree at 2966 N. Main Street. Case #COA2025-05

Ms. Channele Campbell introduced this agenda item. This is a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by David Shelton for the replacement of a maple tree with a dogwood tree at 2966 North Main Street. The applicant would like to remove the trees due to a boxelder bug infestation. Normally, an arborist report is used to determine the health of the tree. Due to the underlying circumstances, there was none submitted.

Mr. David Shelton explained that his home was being infested by boxelder bugs. He provided an overview of boxelder bugs, stating that they are often found on trident maples because they serve as a food source. The insect can be found on trident maples, silver maples, and ash trees. The bugs use the tree sap and seeds as a food source and will sometimes try to enter homes during the winter. Mr. Shelton stated that on some sunny days they cannot open the back door, garage door, or car door without the boxelders bugs swarming.

Mr. Shelton stated that the trident maple tree was not native to that property and that he planted the tree ten years ago. He asked the HPC for help to remove the tree. Mr. Shelton stated that they had pest control spray the property, but it has not been effective in removing the boxelder bugs. He stated that the bugs were trying to enter the home and that they were afraid the bugs would get into the attic. Mr. Shelton is requesting to remove the tree and replace it with as large of a dogwood tree that they could find and afford.

Commissioner Bramlett asked where the tree was located on the property. Mr. Shelton responded that the tree was to the right of the driveway between the driveway and the church.

Chairman Gallagher reiterated the applicant's statement that the boxelder bug's primary food source is maple. He asked if the pest control company thought that removal of the maple will facilitate removal of the bugs. Mr. Shelton responded that removing the tree was the best way to minimize the infestation per the recommendation of pest control. He stated that they went through the process to try and show the HPC that they are not just asking to cut down a tree.

Chairman Gallagher noted that per the HPC guidelines, dogwood is a recommended

native tree to be planted on the property.

Chairman Gallagher called for a motion.

Motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application by Vice Chair Whipple.

Seconded by Commissioner Bramlett.

Chairman Gallagher proceeded with a roll call vote for approval. Vote taken, Motion unanimously approved 4-0. Motion carried.

6. COAA Approval by City Staff and HPC Chair

A. COAA2025-01 - 2926 Lewis St

This is a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by Tyler Lenn for the removal of three dead trees located at 2926 Lewis Street. This application was administratively approved on January 22, 2025.

7. Discussion

Chairman Gallagher opened the floor to Discussion.

Hearing no discussion, he closed the floor.

8. Public Comments

Chairman Gallagher opened the floor for public comment.

Hearing no public comment, Chairman Gallagher closed the floor.

9. Staff Comment

A. Updates on the Locally Funded Survey

1. Introduction of students from the Public History Program at Kennesaw State University (KSU)

Ms. Chanelle Campbell announced that students from Kennesaw State University (KSU) were present at the meeting. She stated that staff has been providing the Board with updates regarding the locally funded survey. She introduced the students and Professor Dickey, who have been tasked with completing the survey, to the HPC so the commissioners could put a face to the students going out into the field. She stated the students would be going out into the field starting in March. She also stated that letters have gone out to the property owners so they are aware of the student's presence. Staff is working with the professor and students to take precautions to ensure that the survey is done safely, and that the students learn something from the process. The students will be working closely with the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) Historic Department to ensure that the survey meets all requirements.

Dr. Jennifer Dickey, the professor of the class, introduced herself and her students. She expressed that the survey was a great opportunity for the students to do some field work and learn something about this process. She stated that the students will be asked to wear safety vests to minimize the risk. She stated that they appreciate the opportunity to do the work on behalf of the City of Kennesaw. Chairman Gallagher thanked Dr. Dickey and the KSU students for being part of providing the survey to the

city and to the commission. Dr. Dickey thanked the HPC for the opportunity.

Ms. Campbell stated that any calls from the public about the survey can be directed to herself or Mr. Darryl Simmons. She explained that the survey is being completed based on recommendations provided by Ethos. The completed survey and updated data from KSU and DCA will be used to update the historic standards. The survey is intended to be completed during the 2025 spring semester, but may run into the summer semester.

10. Adjourn

Chairman Gallagher adjourned the meeting at 9:32 a.m.