

**MINUTES OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING
CITY OF KENNESAW
Council Chambers
(2529 J.O. Stephenson Avenue, Kennesaw, GA 30144)
August 15, 2025
8:00 AM**

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chairman Gallagher called the meeting to order at 8:03 am.

Roll Call: Patrick Gallagher, Kevin Whipple, Sharon Blandford, Andrew Bramlett, Rachel Butler, Thomas Neaves

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

Speakers: Kevin Lares (Applicant), Louise Aldridge (Property Owner's Representative), Alci Costa (Property Owner), Gabriella Costa (Property Owner), Mary Whitlock (City Resident)

2. Approval of the Meeting Minutes

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes: July 18, 2025

Commissioner Neaves commented that the meeting minutes were thorough and complemented staff.

Mr. Darryl Simmons thanked the Commissioner.

Chairman Gallagher called for a motion.

Motion to approve by Commissioner Neaves.

Seconded by Vice Chair Whipple.

Chairman Gallagher proceeded with a vote for approval.

Vote taken, motion approved 5-0. Motion carried.

3. Financial Report

Mr. Darryl Simmons presented the financial report. The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) balance was audited July 31st, 2025. There has been no change in the balance. The total balance is \$23,398. There has been no change in expenditures for the last 30 days.

Chairman Gallagher called for a motion.

Motion to approve by Vice Chair Whipple.

Seconded by Commissioner Neaves.

Chairman Gallagher proceeded with a vote for approval.

Vote taken, motion approved 5-0. Motion carried.

4. Old Business

Mr. Darryl Simmons reminded the Commissioners that cases would now have a section

for public comment when an official motion was made.

Due to traffic issues, the representative for case COA2025-06 would be arriving late.

Mr. Simmons suggested that the Historic Preservation Commission hear the cases out of order.

Chairman Gallagher called for a motion.

Motion by Commissioner Bramlett to hear the agenda out of order and hear COA2025-01 prior to COA2025-06.

Seconded by Commissioner Neaves.

Chairman Gallagher proceeded with a vote for approval.

Vote taken, motion approved 5-0. Motion carried.

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

Mr. Darryl Simmons introduced this agenda item. This project is a previously heard and approved Certificate of Appropriateness application to renovate the existing historic structure at 2908 Moon Station Rd. At the January 17, 2025 meeting, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) voted to approve the request of the renovation with five distinct conditions:

1. The applicant will return to the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) with detailed plan specifications of exterior materials for siding, roof, and lighting fixture 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 Board;
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 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 in the interim as the final plans for the foundation and exterior renovations are completed. This item will be completed as soon as possible to prevent detrimental effect to the structure.

Mr. Simmons stated that the applicant was returning to provide updates on the materials used in the renovation. The applicant would also be seeking approval for material to cover the chimneys, which are currently framed but unfinished pending the HPC's approval of the materials. Mr. Simmons yielded the floor to the applicant to provide an overview of the materials and a status on the construction.

Mr. Kevin Lares stated that the chimneys were ready to be covered and provided

samples of the proposed chimney material for the Commissioners to review. The material was sourced from Tennessee in the same color and brick size as the original brick chimney. Mr. Lares commented that the presented bricks were half bricks instead of full-sized bricks because a full-sized brick with the same size and color as the original chimney could not be located.

Mr. Lares provided additional construction updates. Hardie siding with a 4.5 inch reveal and replica window trims were installed, the original windows and doors were retained, and the original carriage lamps were restored and reinstalled. The foundation had also been repaired, which was necessary to prevent the building from collapsing. After the foundation repair, a drainage issue developed where water pooled on the left side of the house. The applicant is proposing to create a new concrete slab to tie into the existing slab and install drains to allow water to flow off the site. The applicant plans to resubmit plans showing the new concrete slab and drain plans, as well as additional structural plans that will impact the interior. Mr. Lares explained that his intent was to get approval on the chimney brick so it could be installed.

Commissioner Gallagher asked if the application was for exterior finishes. He also asked if the applicant intended to return to the HPC with the final drainage design and details on its impacts on the landscaping and site features. Mr. Lares responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Butler asked if the applicant was using thin brick or full-bedded brick. Mr. Lares responded that they could not locate the full-bedded brick to cover the chimney. The closest material the applicant could locate was the thin brick, but in the same color and size as the original. Mr. Lares added that the original chimneys were non-functional, and the new chimneys would also be non-functional. Commissioner Bulter asked if the brick would only be placed on the chimneys. Mr. Lares responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Butler commented that there are no mentions of thin brick versus thick brick in the Historic District Design Standards. She commented that she disliked thin brick. Mr. Lares responded that he understood a full-brick match was more desirable, but that the full brick options available did not have the same look as the original brick. The brick supplier, Alley-Cassetty Brick, was unable to locate a full-size brick.

Hearing no other commissioner comments or questions, Chairman Gallagher opened the floor for public comment. Hearing no public comment, Chairman Gallagher closed the floor to public comment.

Chairman Gallagher called for a motion.

Vice Chair Whipple called for a motion to approve the chimney brick material as submitted with the following condition:

Approved brick material shall only be applied to the two chimneys.

Seconded by Commissioner Blandford.

Chairman Gallagher proceeded with a vote for approval.

Vote taken. Vice Chair Whipple, Commissioner Blandford, Commissioner Bramlett, and Commissioner Neaves voted in favor. Commissioner Butler voted against. Motion approved 4-1. Motion carried.

B. Exterior Renovation (Alteration): 2926 Lewis Street

Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness application to alter the existing historic structure with the addition of a new restroom, new laundry room, new break room and remodel to the existing front porch stairs. Case #2025-06A

Mr. Simmons introduced this agenda item. This application revisits the Certificate of Appropriateness application for an exterior renovation to the existing structure located at 2926 Lewis Street. At the April 25, 2025 HPC meeting, the project was approved with the condition that exposed plain concrete block is not permitted and must be covered or finished with materials that match the existing building as closely as possible. The applicant is returning with further detail on the exterior, including clarification on the front entryway, and updates on Fire Marshal requirements.

Ms. Louise Aldridge, representative for the applicant, stated that the project for the existing house had received approval two months ago. The application was brought back before the HPC because the Fire Marshal is requiring modification to the existing entry door. The modification would be to replace the existing entry door with a new entry door with 32 inches of clearance.

Chairman Gallagher asked if the applicant was also presenting new details on the stonework that would cover the concrete block on the stairs and the ramp. Ms. Gabriella Costa, property owner, responded that the material for the ramp and stairs will not be exposed concrete block. Ms. Louise Aldridge stated that the stairs and ramp were discussed at the prior HPC meeting and that the purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Fire Marshal's requirement for the door size. Ms. Costa added that the applicants would like to keep and restore the original door because it is unique to the house. She stated that the Fire Marshal was requiring the change, but they were unsure what the HPC thought about replacing the door.

Commissioner Butler asked if there was an image of the existing door available. Ms. Costa did not have an image of the door. Commissioner Butler asked how the applicant was proposing to replace the door. Vice Chair Whipple asked if there was a picture of the proposed replacement door. Ms. Costa responded that they did not have a picture because they did not want to replace the door. The applicants requested HPC assistance in helping them keep the existing door. Mr. Simmons stated that the city cannot override safety requirements from the Fire Marshal's office. Mr. Simmons stated that the applicant would need to find and present a door that meets Fire Marshal standards and has architectural elements appropriate for the location.

Ms. Mary Whitlock, city resident, commented that removing the existing door removes the character of the house. She proposed permanently blocking the existing entry to maintain the existing door since the existing entry did not have a wheelchair-accessible

ramp.

Mr. Simmons explained that the Fire Marshal typically requires a minimum number of egress points, especially in places of assembly. He noted that it would be important if the Fire Marshal designated the front door as an egress point. Vice Chair Whipple asked if the plans submitted to the Fire Marshal specified that the door is to remain and swing outwards. Mr. Simmons stated that the doors swing outward according to the plans. Commissioner Butler and Vice Chair Whipple commented that it would be unlikely for the front door on a residential property to swing outward.

Vice Chair Whipple stated that there are provisions in the building code and life safety code for existing historic structures and doors. He recommended the applicant's architect look at that section more closely and present it to the Fire Marshal as a last resort. If the Fire Marshal insists on the requirement, the HPC will require the applicant to present the new proposed door's appearance, style, and size. He added that there are many new technologies to make new doors look very similar to historic doors. Vice Chair Whipple commented that a similar situation occurred when renovating the carriage house adjacent to depot park where the door did not meet Fire Marshal requirements. The door was repurposed as a makeup counter and the entry door was replaced with a metal clad door. He suggested that the applicant could repurpose the existing door into an interior feature to keep the door associated with the house.

Mr. Simmons agreed with the recommendations and reiterated that the applicant's architect should return to the Fire Marshal and make the case that there are enough egress points to allow the existing door to remain. Vice Chair Whipple added that the applicant may have a strong case because the primary exit complies with ADA requirements and may result in the front door functioning as a secondary access point. Mr. Simmons added that the Commissioners would need to make a motion to stay the application or to have the applicant come back after a consultation with the Fire Marshal.

Commissioner Butler asked if the ramp was still being discussed as part of the application. Chairman Gallagher commented that the plans still appear to show exposed concrete block. He asked the applicant if the concrete block would be covered. Ms. Costa stated that the concrete block would be covered and that the plans showed the internal structure of the steps and ramp. Mr. Simmons added that the material finish was not shown on the drawings.

Commissioner Neaves asked if the existing door on the sunroom would be kept but be inaccessible to the public. Ms. Costa responded that she did not think the door was functional and that they intended to keep the door non-functional.

Commissioner Neaves asked if the applicant planned to reuse the existing stair material to cover the concrete block on the stairs. Mr. Alci Costa, property owner, stated that the material could not be reused because it was unusually shaped. He stated that the ramp and the front porch would be covered in bricks to get close to the appearance of the

existing material.

Commissioner Butler asked staff if the HPC had approved this item previously. Mr. Simmons responded that it was heard at a prior meeting. Chairman Gallagher stated that the item was presented to the HPC in April. Vice Chair Whipple stated that some of the conditions included not allowing concrete block and a requirement to use brick cladding. He added that the HPC did not see many issues aside from some material questions, and that the door was not discussed at the time because it was not a known issue. Commissioner Butler asked if the ramp was part of the proposal presented in April. Mr. Simmons responded in the affirmative. Chairman Gallagher commented that there is an existing wooden ramp on the property.

Hearing no additional commissioner comment, Chairman Gallagher opened the floor for public comment. Hearing no public comment, Chairman Gallagher closed the floor to public comment.

Ms. Aldridge asked if the applicant would need to return to the HPC if the Fire Marshal required a door replacement. Vice Chair Whipple recommended that the applicant contact staff with the Fire Marshal's decision. He further recommended that if a door replacement is required, the architect should create door elevations and submit the elevations to staff. Staff would then determine whether a commission meeting or an administrative approval is required. Ms. Aldridge asked if they would need to return to the HPC if the Fire Marshal allowed the applicant to keep the door. Chairman Gallagher responded that the applicant would not need to return to the HPC if the Fire Marshal allows the existing door to remain.

Chairman Gallagher called for a motion.

Vice Chair Whipple called for a motion to approve with the following conditions:

1. Final decision on front door placement shall be tabled pending additional information provided by the applicant;
2. No plain concrete block shall be exposed to view from the public right-of-way from any side of the residence;
3. All stairs and ramps must be clad in the appropriate full bed brick material;
4. The applicant shall present any required design changes to the Historic Preservation Commission prior to construction.

Seconded by Commissioner Neaves.

Chairman Gallagher proceeded with a vote for approval.

Vote take, motion approved 5-0. Motion carried.

C. New Non-Residential Construction: 2926 Lewis Street

Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted for the construction of a new event space with a dance area, bride and groom suite, restroom for men and women, fire riser mechanical room, and mezzanine with an office. Case #COA2025-06B

Ms. Louise Aldridge presented this agenda item. This is a Certificate of Appropriateness application for a new event barn located at 2926 Lewis Street. The

proposed building includes an event space, a dance area, bride and groom suite rooms, restrooms, a fire riser mechanical room, and an unfinished mezzanine, which will require a future permit. The total construction area is 6108.5 sq. ft. Ms. Aldridge stated that the applicant designed the project with careful consideration of the historic character of the area to ensure the project compliments the surrounding environment. She explained that the project was presented at the April HPC meeting and the Commission requested that the applicant change the outside to have more features and more details to look more like the surrounding buildings.

Mr. Darryl Simmons stated that additional comments were made about the size, location, and exterior features of the building during the April HPC meeting. Issues included the lack of exterior design detail on the building, the location and orientation of the building on Lewis Street, the absence of a landscaping buffer between the building and the curb, the absence of material details, and concerns with the overall size of the structure. Since the last presentation, the building has been made smaller and the location of the building was adjusted to have an entry point on Dallas Street. The build-to line was also adjusted to place the building closer to Lewis Street than the existing structure.

Vice Chair Whipple commented that at the previous meeting for the agenda item, the applicants had been referred to section 5 of the HPC guidelines because there were multiple questions about the previous design.

Chairman Gallagher asked about the role of the Central Business District Project process in reviewing and approving the project. Mr. Simmons responded that the Planning and Zoning department had judgment on whether a property is large enough to be approved through the Central Business District Project approval process. Mr. Simmons determined that based on the scale and nature of the design, the project should be reviewed as a Certificate of Appropriateness application by the HPC.

Chairman Gallagher noted issues with the project's building mass, scale, and form. He explained that the project could not exceed 2500 square feet per floor per section 5.2.06 of the Historic District Design Standards and that the maximum building height was 45 feet. Chairman Gallagher noted that the presented plans show a proposed base building footprint in excess of the allowable square footage. He also noted that there were building height discrepancies on the plans.

Chairman Gallagher expressed concern that there was insufficient on-site parking for the event space and that offsite parking would be needed to accommodate the additional space. Mr. Simmons stated that in the Central Business District, all required parking does not have to be on site. He explained that the applicant is required to present the city with a written document showing parking agreements with adjoining properties. He stated that staff met with the applicant and recommended they secure off-site parking agreements, and the applicant agreed to pursue that option. Mr. Simmons added that the maximum building height is determined by an average of neighboring buildings, which would include Park at Main across the street, the Brain

Station on the corner of Dallas Street and Main Street, and some single-family residential buildings and single-story commercial buildings in the area. Mr. Simmons recommended that the applicant average the neighboring building height information and present the information to the HPC along with the relationship between the proposed building height and the existing building height. Commissioner Bramlett commented that he would be interested in size of the proposed building in relationship to the existing building.

Vice Chair Whipple stated the HPC needed more clarification on the reasons behind certain design decisions, like the gambriel roof line, and how those design decisions relate to architectural details and features found in the residential housing stock in the historic district. Vice Chair Whipple commented that he is not used to seeing the barn-type look in the City. Ms. Gabriella Costa responded that across the street at Park at Main, there is a gambriel roof line that they drew inspiration from for the design.

Vice Chair Whipple also commented that he was concerned about the overall mass of the building. He suggested the issue might be a lack of articulation on the building facade, and noted that even with the windows and doors, a pedestrian would be presented with a flat facade in close proximity to Lewis Street and Dallas Street. Vice Chair Whipple asked if the porch would be placed on the parking lot side. Ms. Costa responded that one Romeo and Juliet balcony will face Dallas Street and one balcony will face the house to add some interest to the facades. Commissioner Bramlett asked if the porch portion presented in the plans from April had been closed in. Ms. Costa responded that there had been a porch on the parking lot side in previous plans but that the space had been closed in on the latest plans.

Chairman Gallagher commented that the HVAC units had been moved from the parking lot side to the Lewis Street Side of the building. He asked how it would be screened. Ms. Costa responded that the landscaping plan shows that the HVAC units will be covered. Chairman Gallagher commented that he did not see any screening on the plans. Vice Chair Whipple asked if the applicant's intention was to screen the units with vegetation or fencing. Ms. Costa responded that both vegetation and fencing would be used for screening. Chairman Gallagher asked why the HVAC units were moved to the street side, which has more public visibility. Ms. Costa responded that the units needed to be moved to the other side because of the entry. Chairman Gallagher asked if it was a Fire Marshal requirement. Ms. Costa responded in the affirmative.

Vice Chair Whipple asked if the plans had been through Fire Marshal review. Ms. Costa responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Neaves commented that he liked the proposed elevations more than the previous plans. He stated he agreed with Commissioner Whipple on the blank, uninteresting space on the top left and right elevations. He commented that it would be nice to see something on the facade because of the mass of the elevation.

Commissioner Butler stated that there appeared to be concrete block fence around the dumpster enclosure. She noted that exposed concrete block was not a permitted material in the Historic District.

Chairman Gallagher opened the floor to public comment. Hearing no public comment, he closed the floor to public comment.

Mr. Simmons recommended the HPC request additional information from the applicant, including pictures of exterior architectural elements and features in the area, the average height and mass of adjoining contributing structures, and the height ratio between the existing house and the proposed new building. He explained that there would also need to be a look at how Fire Marshal requirements and Historic District Design Standard requirements could be met with regard to the building mass and square footage.

Commissioner Butler asked if the city's recommendation was to dismiss the requirement in section 5.2.06 that infill buildings be no larger than 2500 square feet per floor. Mr. Simmons responded that staff and the HPC would need to see if the applicant could meet that standard by reducing square footage. Commissioner Butler asked if the applicant could split the site in two, so the lot would not be considered an infill lot. Vice Chair Whipple commented that the HPC misinterpreted section 5.2.06. He explained that the requirement for a maximum of 2500 square feet per floor is specified in the Design Standards as for detached living/working units.

Chairman Gallagher called for a motion.

Vice Chair Whipple called for a motion to approve with the following conditions: contingent on the applicant coming back before the historic preservation commission with clarifications that include

1. The applicant shall return to the Historic Preservation Commission with photos of adjacent properties, both residential and commercial, that contribute to the general aesthetic of the proposed elevations and massings as presented;
2. The applicant shall return to the Historic Preservation Commission with additional documentation from the architect of record or similar designer with information regarding the average height and mass of adjacent contributing structures, including commercial structures, such as the Brain Station, and residential structures, such as Park at Main;
3. The applicant shall return to the Historic Preservation Commission with additional documentation regarding the height and mass relationship between the new proposed event barn and the existing historic residence on the property;
4. No exposed plain concrete block shall be permitted on the property, including around the dumpster enclosure;
5. The applicant shall return to the Historic Preservation Commission with an updated landscaping plan or additional clarifications regarding HVAC equipment screening.

Seconded by Commissioner Neaves.

Chairman Gallagher proceeded with a vote for approval.

Vote taken, motion approved 5-0. Motion carried.

5. New Business

6. COAA Approval by City Staff and HPC Chair

A. COAA2025-15 - 2986 N. Main Street

This is a Certificate of Appropriateness application for 2986 North Main Street. The Certificate of Appropriateness was submitted by Window World of North Atlanta to replace four windows with double-hung white windows and 2986 North Main Street. The application was administratively approved on July 25th, 2025.

B. COAA2025-16 - 3000 N. Main Street

This is a Certificate of Appropriateness application for 3000 North Main Street. The Certificate of Appropriateness was submitted by William Benson for minor siding and trim repairs. The application was administratively approved on August 4, 2025.

C. COAA2025-17 - 2820 S. Main Street

This is a Certificate of Appropriateness application for 2820 South Main Street. The Certificate of Appropriateness was submitted by the City of Kennesaw to replace a dumpster gate. The application was administratively approved on August 4, 2025.

D. COAA2025-18 - 2971 N. Main Street

This is a Certificate of Appropriateness application for 2971 North Main Street. The Certificate of Appropriateness was submitted by Midaugas Judvytis to install a fence on the left side of the property. The application was administratively approved on August 4, 2025 with the following conditions:

1. Fence must be located behind the set back line established by the front facade of the house;
2. The fence set back should be visually and measurably distinct from the facade.

7. Discussion

Commissioner Butler stated that the site of the former Hair Junction Antique Store on Main Street looked horrible. She commented that the site had a huge puddle of water with a handicapped sign in the middle. She recommended that the Commission ensure there is a replacement use for a property next time the HPC was presented with a demolition application.

Mr. Simmons responded that immediately after the demolition a water problem was identified on the site. The Public Works Director and Planning and Zoning met with the property owner and decided, as a temporary measure, to stage a detention pond to prevent water from flowing onto Watts Drive or Main Street. Mr. Simmons stated that there were talks and some concept drawings for the next development to go on that street corner. He noted that those drawings will be submitted in the future as part of a Central Business District Project application. He stated that he should look into the the issue with the discarded handicap sign on the property.

Vice Chair Whipple asked if there had been ongoing maintenance issues with the

property being kept clean. Mr. Simmons responded that Code Enforcement had been speaking with the property owner to ensure the property owner understands their responsibility to keep the property clean. Vice Chair Whipple commented that the case was presented for demolition to avoid a blight tax and that the owners needed to maintain the property. Mr. Simmons agreed. Commission Neaves commented that he also noticed the puddle and that it did not look intentional. He suggested the placement of a small temporary fence around the standing water to make the site look more intentional and to keep people out of the area. Mr. Simmons stated that he would look into the matter with the Public Works Director as a possible way to designate that the area is not accessible.

8. Public Comments

Chairman Gallagher opened the floor to public comment. Hearing no public comment, he closed the floor to public comment.

9. Staff Comment

10. Adjourn

Chairman Gallagher adjourned the meeting at 9:14 a.m.