

**MINUTES OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING
CITY OF KENNESAW
Council Chambers
(2529 J.O. Stephenson Avenue, Kennesaw, GA 30144)
May 15, 2026
8:00 AM**

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chairman Gallagher called the meeting to order at 8:01 a.m.

Roll Call: Patrick Gallagher, Andrew Bramlett, Rachel Butler, Thomas Neaves, Alexandra DeLuca Berisford, Sharon Blandford

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

Speakers Present: Brandy Morrison, Dale Hughes, Lexie Newhouse, Jay French, Peter Fitzgibbons

2. Approval of the Meeting Minutes

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes: April 17, 2026

Chairman Gallagher called for a motion.

Motion to approve by Commissioner Blandford

Seconded by Vice Chair Bramlett

Chairman Gallagher proceeded with a vote for approval.

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

3. Financial Report

Ms. Chanelle Campbell presented the financial report. The balance remains unchanged from previous months. The carrying balance is \$23,398.

Chairman Gallagher called for a motion.

Motion to approve by Commissioner Neaves

Seconded by Commissioner Blandford

Chairman Gallagher proceeded with a vote for approval.

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

4. Old Business

A. Central Business District: 2861 & 2871 N Main Street

Consideration to review a Central Business District project application to construct a commercial development consisting of a brewery and public plaza on 0.545 +/- acres located at 2861 and 2871 N Main Street (Parcel # 20013801060 & Parcel # 20013801080). Case # CBD2025-04

Ms. Chanelle Campbell introduced this agenda item. This is a Central Business District (CBD) application that was previously reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) for 2861 and 2871 North Main Street. This is for the

project known as Reformation for the construction of a commercial development consisting of a brewery and a public plaza. The applicant has returned to provide an update to the HPC. Ms. Campbell invited the applicant's architect, Mrs. Brandy Morrison, to present updates to the site and building. Ms. Campbell also stated that she would be available to answer any questions.

Mrs. Brandy Morrison explained that she would be providing an intermediate update on the project design as requested at the previous project presentation. Mrs. Morrison shared documentation and material specifications for the proposed brick with the Commissioners. She stated that after the last presentation, she was sent historic documentation on the block by Vice Chair Bramlett. The documentation on the block and the two-story building on the far left of the block, known as the Collier building, served as inspiration for the new building to be constructed on the corner. Details pulled from the existing two-story building included the size and spacing of the windows, the height and opaqueness of the second-story balcony railing, floor heights, and the parapet. Mrs. Morrison explained that the material below the windows would be accent brick instead of bead-board due to the tenant's concern about wood being placed too close to the grade. She also explained that copying the railing exactly would be expensive to manufacture and maintain, so horizontal cementitious siding would be used. A taller railing would be placed above the opaque railing to reflect code requirements, and it would be topped with a bar material for people to place their drinks.

Mrs. Morrison presented details on the side of the building facing J.O Stephenson Avenue. She stated that the plan was for the building and balcony to wrap around the edge but explained that a significant grade change in the sidewalk presented a challenge. To accommodate the grade change, planters and seating benches were proposed to raise the street corner and shorten the columns while providing landscaping and places for people to sit.

Mrs. Morrison provided an overview of the site layout for the rear plaza and details on the accessory buildings. She stated that the plaza would consist of a seating wall, landscaping, street trees to provide shade, a stage, a restroom building, and a production building. The production building was modeled after the Whistle Stop Café. Features of the production building include a suspended awning and large storefront windows. Mrs. Morrison explained that the doors would be fixed shut to prevent people from entering the production building from the street. The rear elevation for the main two-story building was then reviewed. Mrs. Morrison explained that the roof would drain to the rear of the property, consistent with what is typical for buildings in the district. An egress stair would also be located off the back of the building to provide access from the brewery to the lawn. Mrs. Morrison then provided details on the space between the existing Whistle Stop building and the proposed two-story building. Previous elevations had the two buildings connected. After review by a structural engineer, there was concern that the exterior wall of the Whistle Stop, which had significant cracking, could not support the two-story building. Mrs. Morrison explained that the decision was made to put an approximately twelve-foot wide space between the buildings. The space

would have a courtyard with tables and a cooler to store beer. Mrs. Morrison noted that the cooler would be screened. Mrs. Morrison reviewed the courtyard side elevation. The elevation includes a door communicating between the buildings. She then reviewed the elevations for the proposed production building, restroom building, and the stage. The production building would have windows to allow people to see into the building, rear access for transporting goods, a suspended awning, and a pedestrian entrance off of Bigger's Avenue. The stage, which would be large enough to accommodate a small band, would have wood framing at the back to buffer noise. The restrooms include doors that face the main building's rear elevation and will not be visible from the street. Proposed door and window schedules were also shared. Mrs. Morrison explained that a civil engineer reviewed the proposed site design, utilities, and topography to ensure the plan was viable and that the site would not trigger any major design changes. Based on the review, updates were made to how the building interacted with the sloping corner. This included adjusting the location of the stairs and the size and scale of the planters.

Chairman Gallagher opened the floor to comments and questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Neaves asked if there were any fire concerns with the alleyway given there was a single door, a metal gate, and brick wall. Mrs. Morrison responded that the gate would be operable with panic hardware on the interior to allow people to exit. Commissioner Neaves asked if the gate would be exit only. Mrs. Morrison responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Butler observed that the dumpster appeared close to the residential house in the back of the property. She stated that per 5.10.03, "Dumpsters shall be placed in the least visible location on the lot and shall not be located within 50 feet of a residential use." She asked how far the dumpster was from the residential house. Mrs. Morrison responded that she would need to check. She asked if the distance would be from the property line or the house. Commissioner Butler stated that the standard did not specify. Ms. Campbell stated that when referencing buffers, the distance is typically from the property line.

Chairman Gallagher commented that he did not see any HVAC plans or equipment. He asked if the HVAC equipment would be roof mounted behind the parapet. Mrs. Morrison responded in the affirmative, explaining that the height of the parapets were to hide the equipment. Vice Chair Bramlett asked if the same applied to the production building in the back of the property. Mrs. Morrison responded in the affirmative. Commissioner Butler asked if the HVAC equipment would be seen due to the sloping roof. Mrs. Morrison responded that the equipment would be visible from the rear of the building.

Commissioner Neaves asked if the awnings on the two-story building would be made of standing metal seam. Mrs. Morrison responded in the affirmative. Chairman Gallagher asked if there was a color proposed for the awnings. Mrs. Morrison responded that the color of the awnings had not yet been discussed.

Chairman Gallagher commented that he saw very little landscaping on the site. He asked if there was an additional landscaping plan and if the plans presented were preliminary. Mrs. Morrison responded that the plans were preliminary. She explained that the intention was for the space to be primarily a lawn with some landscaping around the sides because of the stage area and gathering space.

Commissioner Neaves asked if there was going to be a fence on the J.O. Stephenson side of the property or if the area would be left open. Mrs. Morrison responded that there would be no fences. She explained that retaining walls would be placed on the edge of the property to accommodate the grade change and provide seating. She also stated that the space was intended to be an open, publicly accessible area.

Commissioner Butler asked what the height of the fence was between the two buildings. Mrs. Morrison responded that the fence height would be determined by the size of the cooler. She explained that since the tenant had not yet selected a cooler, the exact height of the fence is not yet known. Commissioner Butler stated that the maximum height permitted in the standards is six feet. She stated that she did not know if the height is flexible given that the purpose of the fence is to hide mechanical equipment and utilities. Mr. Dale Hughes oriented the Commissioners to the courtyard area and highlighted the location of the doors, the fence, a false brick wall, the proposed cooler location, and another facade to screen the cooler. He explained that the fence would be wrought iron and under six feet to allow the seating area to be seen from the street. He also discussed some preliminary ideas for wall plantings. Mrs. Morrison expressed that there might be some confusion. She stated that she was referring to the height of the brick wall at the back of the courtyard, not the fence by the street. She apologized for the misunderstanding and stated that the fence height would follow the restrictions in the historic design standards.

Chairman Gallagher sought confirmation that there would be a brick wall within the courtyard space for the cooler and a brick wall facing the plaza to shield the cooler and look like a wall connecting the buildings. Mrs. Morrison explained that the intention was for the wall to look like part of the building rather than a fence. She reiterated that the walls would hide the cooler and that the cooler would be around ten feet tall. Mr. Hughes added that every area in the building is designated for events. He stated that the courtyard was designed for interior events between the two buildings. He added that the wall will eventually need to be high enough to put a projector screen.

Ms. Campbell stated that the presentation was conceptual. She explained that the goal of the presentation was to identify any red flags in the proposal. If there were none, the applicant would take the HPC's comments and move forward with completing their civil plans.

Mrs. Morrison stated that they would present to the commission in the future and incorporate any feedback into the next presentation. She explained that they understood this is a major project for Downtown Kennesaw and that the applicant

wanted to ensure they were meeting the city's expectations for the development.

Vice Chair Bramlett asked if there were any changes to the Whistle Stop building from the last presentation. Mrs. Morrison responded that there had not been changes to the Whistle Stop building. She explained that they do not yet have a tenant for the space. She added that based on the provided photos, the brick on the building was a veneer done in the last twenty to thirty years. Mrs. Morrison stated that they did not plan to remove the veneer.

Chairman Gallagher referenced the applicant's comment about the location of the new building and the structural distress to the Whistle Stop. He asked if there were plans as part of the new development to shore up the Whistle Stop to minimize any future degradation. Mrs. Morrison responded that they would discuss stabilizing the structure while construction was ongoing. She explained that the structural engineer had not mentioned stabilizing the structure. She stated that they could discuss if any bracing could be done temporarily to ensure the building was not jeopardized.

Commissioner Neaves commented that the design for the project was, overall, looking good. Mrs. Morrison thanked Commissioner Neaves for the comment. Commissioner DeLuca Berisford and Vice Chair Bramlett agreed.

Chairman Gallagher asked if there were any further questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, he opened the floor for public comment.

Ms. Lexie Newhouse, a resident of downtown Kennesaw for the last five years, spoke in support of the project. She commented that Mr. Dale Hughes had an extensive history of revitalizing historic homes and converting them into commercial spaces in Downtown Kennesaw. She expressed that the partner they selected for the project, Reformation, also had an extensive history of that with their work in Downtown Woodstock and the Mill in Canton. She thanked the Commissioners for their consideration.

Mrs. Campbell explained that a vote did not need to be taken because the presentation was an update to a previously approved project. She stated that the HPC:s feedback would enable the applicant to move forward with completing the civil plans that are required for pulling permits. Chairman Gallagher commented that the applicant should clarify the location of the dumpster, clarify the details on the screening for the dumpsters, and provide a more formal landscape plan that shows the designation of proposed trees, shrubs, and other plantings.

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. Chanelle Campbell introduced this item. This is an update for the project located at

2615 and 2681 South Main Street. While the property is not within the historic district, it is within the CBD district and was required to come before the HPC. At their last presentation to the HPC there was feedback on the building's rendering and landscaping plans. The applicant has since gone through the formal process of submitting their site plan and was granted the permit. The applicant is now trying to get building permits to go vertical. The purpose of the presentation is to show updates to the landscaping plan and the renderings, materials, and elevations for the proposed structures.

Mr. Jake French introduced himself as senior development lead for the project. He also introduced Peter Fitzgibbons as day-to-day project development lead. He announced that they would be providing a project update on Kennesaw Phase II. He stated that they closed on the project in April, have an equity partner, got their Land Disturbance Permit approved, cleared trees from the property, installed erosion control, and obtained their seven-day letter. He also shared that the building permits were approved aside from the condition to present to the HPC. Mr. French stated that the expected project completion date was April 2027. He also shared that the first units and restaurants portion would be delivered September 2026.

Mr. French oriented the Commissioners to the location of the site as across the street from the Lacey at South Main. He described this phase as the Lacey's smaller, younger sister, as it would be on 7 +/- acres compared to the Lacey's 10 +/- acres. Mr. French showed the 20 percent site plan previously presented to the HPC and identified the locations of Building 100, Building 200, interior amenities, the pool courtyard, a one-story parking deck, the restaurant, a park along Main Street, and additional parking. He shared the new colored site plan, which included the landscape plan. He described the project as mostly the same as the previous site plan. Noted changes include expanding the restaurant to 3000 square feet, eliminating an access road on the left to allow for more landscaping, relocating the dog park to the back left of the site, adding 22 parking spaces along Main Street, and adding an inset into the back of Building 100 to accommodate the 50-foot cemetery buffer. Mr. French also presented the design details for a pedestrian crosswalk and a sidewalk extension as required by zoning conditions. He stated that the pedestrian crosswalk would be signalized with a raised median. He shared that the plans were reviewed and approved as part of their Land Disturbance Permit. He explained that the crosswalk and improved sight lines from clearing the site would help to slow traffic. Mr. French stated that the sidewalk extension would go from the Lacey Phase I to Sardis Street and be 7 feet wide.

Mr. French reviewed the renderings presented to the HPC last year. He then reviewed the updated renderings at 100 percent design. He shared that the restaurant would have an exterior staircase, a white brick exterior, and a canopied rooftop with open seating. Buildings 100 and 200 would include white brick with accents of dark fibrous cement siding, architectural relief, and inset canopies. Renderings were also shown for the pool courtyard, which included a uniquely shaped pool, a pavilion, and some landscaping. Mr. French also provided renderings for the leasing lobby.

Mr. French showed the 20 percent building elevations that were presented at the previous HPC meeting. He then showed the 100 percent elevations for the buildings. He highlighted the location of a canopy where signage for the project would be placed. Mr. French then reviewed the landscaping plan for the project, noting the presence of trees in excess of the tree requirement, a paved entry at the front of the project, a sidewalk that ties into the sidewalk on South Main Street, a landscaping buffer between the project and a Taekwondo business, a black chain link fence along the cemetery buffer, and an 8-foot wood fence painted black along the rear of the project to block off the railroad and lumberyard. Mr. French provided additional details for the landscaping and design of the pool courtyard, which included a unique pool shape, a turf area, a pavilion with a fireplace and TV, and another turf area with an amenity. Mr. French went into further detail about the landscaping in front of Building 200. He shared that trees would be located around the proposed restaurant and that the park on Main Street would sit lower on the site and have turf and seating. He explained their intention was to create a family atmosphere and an active space next to the restaurant.

Vice Chair Bramlett asked if the property was in the historic district or if it was just in the CBD. Mr. French responded that the property was just in the CBD. Vice Chair Bramlett asked if there were any updates on the commercial component of the development across the street and whether they would look similar to the proposed commercial components for the presented project. Mr. French sought to clarify whether the Commissioner was referring to the commercial uses in front of the Lacey Phase I. Vice Chair Bramlett confirmed. Mr. French responded that he had heard discussion about a Starbucks or a coworking space. He explained that he was not part of the commercial piece, but that he could ask and provide an update.

Commissioner Butler asked what the square footage was for the restaurant because there were only twenty-two parking spaces for a two-story restaurant and additional retail in the rear. Mr. French responded that the required square footage for the restaurant was 2500 square feet, but that the restaurant would be 3100 square feet. He explained there were 50 spaces dedicated to the restaurant, which included 22 street parking spaces and dedicated spaces in the parking deck. Commissioner Butler asked how people would know they could park in the parking deck. Mr. French responded that the spots would be designated retail parking only with either stencils on the ground or vertical posts. Chairman Gallagher asked if the stenciling would also be along Main Street. Mr. French responded that those parking spaces were semi-public and on land dedicated to the City. He explained that there would need to be further talks with Public Works about signage in the street parking area. He commented that there were discussions about now wanting apartment residents to take all the street parking.

Commissioner Neaves explained he was not on the Commission when the project was first presented but had read the meeting minutes. He stated that a big concern with the previous elevations was that the buildings were stark along the sidewalk without many forms of relief like awnings and arcades. He commented that it appeared a lot of the comments were addressed as there was more interest and intrigue in the elevations. Mr. French agreed. He stated that they had been intentional about the design. He

commented that the buildings had more depth, color, and architectural relief. He expressed pride in the project and remarked that he was excited to execute on it.

Commissioner Butler asked how many units would be in both buildings in total. Mr. French responded that there would be 300 total units between both buildings and three commercial suites in building 200. He stated that he did not have the exact break-down but estimated that Building 100 would have approximately 185 units and that Building 200 would have the remainder. Mr. Peter Fitzgibbons stated that the units would be a 60-40 split with the majority of units located in the amenity area.

Commissioner Neaves referenced the applicant's comment on differentiating the look of this development from the Lacey. He commented that he liked the idea of the buildings having two separate identities. Mr. French responded that the design approach helps give character to the community, does not look cookie-cutter, and helps establish the project as separate.

Commissioner Butler asked how many parking spots there were for the project in total. Mr. Fitzgibbons responded that there were 242 parking spaces. Commissioner Butler asked if that number included the 22 on-street parking spots. Mr. Fitzgibbons responded that street parking was included in that number. Mr. French stated that there was also a shared use condition and easement with the Lacey across the street that gave the project access to 100 additional parking spaces.

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

Chairman Gallagher asked Ms. Campbell if a formal vote or motion was needed since the project was already approved and the applicant satisfied the requirement to provide updated renderings. Ms. Campbell responded that no formal motion or vote was needed. She clarified that the building permits were on hold until they received formal approval from the HPC for the elevations. She stated that because the HPC has formally reviewed it, they could move forwards with their building permits.

Commissioner Neaves asked if that meant they needed to make a motion to approve the plans. Ms. Campbell responded that a motion was not needed. She explained that the applicant clarified and the HPC approved the fact that the plans were updated per the conditions. She stated that no additional feedback was required.

5. New Business

6. COAA Approval by City Staff and HPC Chair

A. COAA2026-04 - 2305 Lewis Street

This is a Certificate of Appropriateness application for 2305 Lewis Street as submitted by Thomas Aaron for the replacement of wood shutters. The application was reviewed administratively and approved on April 16, 2026.

7. Discussion

Vice Chair Bramlett commented that he spoke with the Atlanta Preservation Center about holding more downtown walking tours. He stated that they should have more dates soon. Chairman Gallagher thanked Vice Chair Bramlett.

8. Public Comments

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

9. Staff Comment

Ms. Chanelle Campbell stated that there was no staff comment. She commented that the department was staying busy with the Comprehensive Plan, the LCI Study, and other studies. She encouraged Commissioners to participate in any trainings or conferences. She also requested that Commissioners encourage the community to participate in the Comprehensive Plan so that staff could get more holistic feedback as they work through the update.

10. Adjourn

Chairman Gallagher adjourned the meeting at 9:03 a.m.