

**MINUTES OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING
CITY OF KENNESAW
Council Chambers
(2529 J.O. Stephenson Avenue, Kennesaw, GA 30144)
January 17, 2025
8:00 AM**

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

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

Roll Call: Rachel Butler, Andrew Bramlett, Patrick Gallagher, Sharon Blandford, Zach Buffington

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

Speakers Present: Kevin Lares (Applicant), Scott Banks (Building Services Director), Orlando Orochena (Property Owner / Applicant), Ricky Stewart (Public Works Director)

2. Election of Officers

Chairman Whipple nominates Patrick Gallagher as Chair.

Vote taken, Patrick Gallagher is declared elected unanimously, as Chairman.

Commissioner Blandford nominates Kevin Whipple as Vice Chair.

Vote taken, Kevin Whipple is declared elected unanimously, as Vice Chairman.

3. Approval of the Meeting Minutes

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes: December 20, 2024

Chairman Whipple called for a motion to approve the meeting minutes from December 20, 2024.

Motion to approve the meeting minutes from December 20, 2024 by Commissioner Blandford.

Seconded by Commissioner Bramlett.

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

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

4. Financial Report

Mr. Darryl Simmons introduced the financial report. As of December 30, 2024, there have been no new expenditures. \$23,398 is the remaining balance in the collected revenues and donations, specifically earmarked for use by the Historic Preservation Commission. In the Planning and Zoning budget, \$1,200 is set aside for travel expenses for training and networking opportunities for members of the HPC to travel within Georgia. There is an education and training budget of \$3,700 and a historic preservation general earmark of \$1,000 for additional expenses.

Chairman Whipple called for a motion to approve the financial report.

Motion to approve the financial report by Vice Chair Gallagher.

Seconded by Commissioner Blandford.

Chairman Whipple proceeded with roll call for approval.

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

5. New Business

A. Exterior Renovation (Alteration): 2908 Moon Station Road

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 Road. Said alterations include a installing a new roof, repairing and adding new siding, installing new gutters, constructing a pergola, and adding some landscaping. Case # COA2025-01

Mr. Darryl Simmons presented this item. This is an exterior alteration for 2908 Moon Station Road. The application is for the renovation of the historic structure, including installing a new roof, repairing and adding siding, installing new gutters, constructing a pergola, and adding some landscaping to the property. The property is located in the big shanty village historic district. There is currently a stop work order for the property due to the building's condition.

Mr. Scott Banks (Building Services Director) explained the reason for the stop work order posted on the property. The applicant came to the Building Services department with a request to remove interior elements to view the condition of the structure's foundation and determine the cost and scope of repairs needed for the foundation to comply with commercial building standards. It was the understanding of the building services department that the applicant would come back and apply for another permit in order to do any additional work. The applicant continued work beyond the scope of the initial permit, including removing the two chimneys on either side of the historic structure. While the chimneys were likely dangerous and in poor condition, the removal was completed without a permit and the building was left open and vacant. Citations were issued for working without a permit and for being open and vacant.

Mr. Kevin Lares (Applicant) stated he spoke with Mr. Banks about the City's recommendation to obtain an engineer's letter for the chimneys because they were separating from the building and presented a hazard. In the process of obtaining the letter from the engineer, the building owner went on the property to complete some interior demolition and removed the chimneys despite the contractor's instructions to wait until proper documentation was obtained. Mr. Lares has the letter from the engineer regarding the chimneys. Mr. Lares's intent is to continue with the permit process to build or rebuild what is currently on the property and notes that they also intend to rebuild the chimneys as they were previously.

Chairman Whipple asked about the extent of siding removal and what material would be used. Mr. Lares responded that they would try to repair as much siding as possible

and replace what cannot be repaired, including additional siding for a bathroom addition. He stated that the siding material will be wood.

Chairman Whipple asked if the scope of the project included new gutters and downspouts. Mr. Lares stated that they would be installing new roofing gutters and downspouts.

Chairman Whipple asked if the roof would be an architectural shingle roof. Mr. Lares confirmed the roof would be an architectural shingle roof.

Chairman Whipple inquired about further details on the replacement of the existing chimneys. Mr. Lares stated the chimney replacements would be done with all new masonry as the existing bricks were crumbling and could not be reused.

Chairman Whipple asked about the engineer's letter and whether the letter specified that the chimneys were recommended for demolition and reconstruction due to their structural integrity and imminent danger. Mr. Lares confirmed.

Chairman Whipple asked what additions to the structure would be made aside from the roof, siding, gutters, and chimney replacements. Mr. Lares stated that a pergola and an exterior bathroom addition would be added to the structure. Vice Chair Gallagher asked if the roofline on the exterior bathroom addition would match the existing roofline. Mr. Lares confirmed.

Vice Chair Gallagher referenced the applicant to Section 6.6.01 on architectural details of the Design Guidelines, which states additions to the building must be period specific. He expressed concern that the pergola was not period specific to the historical setting of the building. Mr. Lares stated he knew the pergola materials have to be fire retardant but needed to know if it is possible or not to add the pergola before designs were finalized. Commissioner Butler asked if the pergola was tied to the building. Mr. Lares stated that the pergola would be independent and not tied to the existing building.

Commissioner Bramlet asked if the archway on the main entrance was also detached from the building. Mr. Lares stated that the archway would be attached to the building.

Commissioner Blandford commented that the existing chimney had a different shape from the proposed chimney replacement design.

Vice Chair Gallagher asked if there was a full landscaping plan showing the types of plantings and locations. Mr. Lares responded that they do not have a landscaping plan. Currently, they intend to clean up the existing landscaping and keep the trees on the property.

Vice Chair Gallagher asked if the applicant was planning on adding a front patio area with seating, and if so, what material would be used for the patio. Mr. Lares confirmed a front patio was planned and that gravel will be used. He also stated that they planned to

use gravel for the pergola floor.

Chairman Whipple asked if the bathroom addition would be clad in a similar siding to match the siding on the existing building. Mr. Lares confirmed.

Chairman Whipple asked if the pergola would be free standing, and if so, what material would be used. Mr. Lares stated that they know from the fire marshal that the material needs to be fire resistant. They put on the plans that the exact material of the pergola was to be determined. Chairman Whipple asked if the applicant intended to complete the pergola at the same time the rest of the work on the historic structure was being completed and if he intended for the work to be on the same permit. Mr. Lares confirmed.

Chairman Whipple stated that the Commission would struggle to make a decision without defined decisions on building materials and actual construction plans. Issues noted included whether the applicant could find a wood siding to match the existing siding, the material for the pergola, and the shape of the chimneys. Mr. Lares stated that there is a company in downtown Atlanta that makes a matching siding with the caveat that the product might be thinner than the existing siding. He stated that he has to go to the company with a piece of the current siding to ensure the materials match. Mr. Simmons stated that the Commission can consider a condition to bring final construction plans back to the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), including a correct rendering that shows the pergola as free standing instead of tying into the building.

Mr. Banks stated that in order to complete the court case, he will require the applicant to hire an engineer to do some internal and external bracing to safeguard the structure. He stated he would like to give the applicant permission for the supports without needing to submit an additional request to the HPC. Chairman Whipple stated that the HPC would include that information in their recommendations with the intent to secure the structure and prevent any further degradation or damage.

Mr. Lares stated that they have a structural plan for supporting the structure. His main concern is the outside of the house because after removing the floor, they discovered foundation missing from some areas of the house. Exterior supports would make the structure safe. Mr. Banks agreed with the applicant and recommended allowing a quarter or footing to be temporarily redone for structural integrity until HPC approves a plan.

Chairman Whipple asked for clarification on the style and specifications for exterior light fixtures noted in the plan. Mr. Lares responded that they intend to install carriage type lamps on the outside on the front of the building and a chandelier on the inside of the archway, but noted the design was not finalized.

Chairman Whipple informed the applicant that the HPC's jurisdiction is solely the building exterior and thus the Commission required detailed information about exterior

materials, exterior massing, and other exterior elements as possible. He also recommended the applicant reference the HPC Design Guidelines.

Commissioner Bramlett asked if the applicant had any details on the signage for the building. Mr. Lares responded that the sign would likely be close to the sidewalk and that the owner was working with the sign company to get a simple design. Chairman Whipple asked the applicant to note that the sign will be separate from the building and free standing on future plans. He also noted that the sign will be under a separate permit and require a separate application. Commissioner Butler asked the applicant to reference section 6.9 of the Design Guidelines when designing the sign for the property.

Commissioner Blandford commented that the arch is shown on the elevation without details. She asked if the arch was attached to the building. Mr. Lares responded that the arch was attached to the structure. Commissioner Blandford stated that more details for the arch would also be needed in subsequent plans because the arch does not align with the historical look of the building.

Chairman Whipple asked if mechanical improvements would be made to the building, and if the mechanical units were noted on the plans. Mr. Lares stated that mechanical improvements and unit locations are notated on the structural plans. Chairman Gallagher asked if exterior mechanical units would be located at the rear of the building and screened. Mr. Lares confirmed and stated that the units are currently on the side but would be moved to the back of the structure.

Commissioner Blandford commented that the existing structure has no roof vents. She asked the applicant to confirm that the drawings show a roof vent on the front and on the restroom addition. Mr. Lares stated there would be roof vents on the front and on the restroom addition. Commissioner Blandford asked if any other vents would be visible from the front. Mr. Lares stated that no other roof vents would be visible from the front.

Mr. Banks recommended that the bracing and shoring be completed with the approval of the building services department. Mr. Lares asked if an application would need to be submitted for that approval. Mr. Banks instructed the applicant to have an engineer submit a plan to the building services department for a minimal building permit. A licensed contractor will be needed to complete the bracing and shoring as a temporary measure. Building services will need to approve the plan and issue a work permit before work is started.

Chairman Whipple called for a motion for the Certificate of Appropriateness application. Motion by Vice Chair Gallagher to approve the exterior renovation with the following conditions:

1. The applicant will return to the Historic Preservation Commission 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 Historic Preservation Commission;
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 Historic Preservation Commission 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 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.

Seconded by Commissioner Blandford.

Chairman Whipple proceeded with a roll call for approval.

Vote taken. Motion approved 5-0. Motion carried to approve the applicant request with conditions.

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

Mr. Darryl Simmons introduced this agenda item. This is a Certificate of Appropriateness application for an exterior alteration to the historic structure located at 2981 North Main Street, which include the addition of two dormers to the roof and the removal of two chimneys for an attic renovation. The structure is a contributing structure to the Main Street historic district and is identified as the Wilder House, built in 1919. Pictures of the property's existing conditions, existing homes on North Main Street that show the predominate architectural elements, and the applicant's rendering showing the proposed dormers and chimney removals are included in the agenda packet. Mr. Simmons noted that while the overhang on the front elevation is not present in the rendering, the applicant has confirmed the feature will not be removed.

Mr. Orlanda Orochena (Property Owner / Applicant) stated that the application for the Certificate of Appropriateness was for an attic renovation is to accommodate his growing family. The renovation includes placing two bedrooms in the attic space and constructing dormers to satisfy ceiling height requirements. He informed the commissioners that the porch would remain attached to the house. He also stated that they viewed the chimneys unsafe due to crumbling brick and mortar and wanted to at least remove the chimneys in the attic space. For materials, Hardie Plank siding would be used for the dormer. Mr. Orochena was under the impression that the materials needed to be different for additions but added that if allowed he would match the concrete shingles currently on home's exterior. The paint and roof shingles would match the existing house.

Commissioner Butler informed Mr. Orochena that additions to the house cannot correlate to the historic building. With an attic renovation, building materials can match the existing house.

Chairman Whipple asked whether the applicant was replacing the siding on the entire house or was only installing new siding on the dormers. Mr. Orochena responded that new siding would be placed on the gabled dormer. Commissioner Blandford asked if the profile on the new Hardie Plank siding would match the 8.25 inch profile on the existing siding. Mr. Orochena stated the current siding material on the house is concrete shingles, but they would match the material if possible. Commissioner Blandford restated her question, clarifying that she was asking if the height of the existing siding would be matched on the dormer. Mr. Orochena confirmed. Chairman Whipple clarified that the size of the reveal between the laps was being discussed. He further explained that historic homes have a much shorter reveal, maybe four or five inches, compared to a new home, which might have a seven inch reveal. He also stated that a stipulations would be that even if the material is not the same, the profile on the siding would need to match.

Chairman Whipple asked if a new roof would be installed on the entire house with materials as presented. Mr. Orochena responded that new roofing would only be installed on the dormers.

Chairman Whipple asked if the chimney removal was integral to the ability to build out the bedrooms. Mr. Orochena responded that it was possible that the dormer could be built around the chimney, but they would like to remove the chimney for safety reasons as his daughter would be in one of the bedrooms. He stated the safety of the structure was his main concern. Chairman Whipple referenced the Design Guidelines which states "Chimney materials and placement are character defining features of historic buildings and must be preserved when feasible. The location of chimneys is essential to house type identification." He stated that the two chimneys are interior to the perimeter of the building and do not have the same character defining form and function as seen with 2908 Moon Station Road. Chairman Whipple also commented that if the application was approved, he would prefer the chimneys remain. Mr. Orochena stated they would be open to keeping the exterior portions of the chimneys on the roof but would like to remove the portion of the structure in the attic to continue with the renovation.

Vice Chair Gallagher expressed apprehension to removing the chimneys, stating that the location and style of the chimneys is a characteristic feature of the Georgian Cottage style structure distinct for early 1900s development in the Georgia piedmont region. He commented that removing the chimneys would remove the historic nature, look, and feel of the property. Vice Chair Gallagher also referenced the Design Guidelines regarding the placement of dormers and stated that while dormers were allowed at side elevation of the roofline, they cannot be a prominent feature and must be in a style typical for the period. He commented that the scale and mass of the dormers are not of a style that would have been prominent at the turn of the century. Vice Chair Gallagher then asked if the applicant had considered using a larger dormer

and extending to the back to prevent visibility from the street and preserve the characteristic chimneys on either side of the structure. Mr. Orochena argued that the proposed dormers match the size and location of dormers on other houses on North Main Street. He stated that the dormer could be moved to the back of the house, but they wanted to avoid that to allow future solar panel placement on the back roof. He also stated that two bedrooms would not fit in a single dormer. Commissioner Bramlett expressed concern about the chimneys. He also stated that while other houses on North Main Street had dormers, the dormers are a different style and on a different style of house.

Commissioner Butler asked if the dormer was the entire bedroom. Mr. Orochena responded that the dormer would hold most of the bedroom. He stated that the size was mainly for ceiling height and egress but expressed willingness to make the dormers thinner.

Commissioner Butler commented that a double wide window on the dormer and the dormer height was of concern. Mr. Orochena responded that the window could be changed to a single wide window

Vice Chair Gallagher asked if consideration been given to adding an addition to the back of the house instead of renovating the attic. Mr. Orochena stated that the option was considered, but due to the size of the garage, limited space due to neighboring properties, and a desire to keep the backyard, they decided to renovate the attic space.

Mr. Simmons stated that the scale and architectural elements of the front dormer are characteristic of the cottage style. He added that a smaller scale dormer closer to the roofline with a single wide window that matches the front dormer would be more appropriate for the intent of the cottage style architecture. Mr. Simmons also stated that the double chimney was a unique architectural element for this style of house and recommended exploring options to keep the chimney and have it shored up on the inside. For the shoring of the chimneys, the City of Kennesaw's Building Department would guide Mr. Orochena accordingly.

Chairman Whipple summarized the major concerns expressed by the HPC, which includes the proposed chimney removals and the proposed massing of the dormers. He recommended the applicant resubmit an updated design and investigate the potential feasibility of one large dormer in the rear of the structure to accommodate two bedrooms. He stated the HPC did not have concerns regarding the dormer materials. Vice Chair Gallagher agreed, adding that the scale and location of the dormer with respect to the cottage style of the house, and retaining of the chimneys were particularly important.

Mr. Orochena asked if it would be possible to keep the exterior portion of the chimney on the roof and remove the portions inside the attic or if they could remove the chimney and rebuild the exterior portion. Chairman Whipple stated that the interior could be

structured differently for the attic renovation to flow correctly, but the exterior portion of the chimney must remain. Commissioner Butler expressed that she would like to see the chimney shored up on the inside to keep the brick material. Commissioner Bramlett agreed.

Commissioner Bramlett commented that he prefers the dormers in their current proposed location with the centerline aligned with the chimneys as opposed to pushing the dormers further to the back of the house. Mr. Orochena responded that they would like to keep the dormers on the sides because there is less space on the back roofline. He also stated that they would try to downsize the dormers and keep the chimneys. Vice Chair Gallagher stated that he proposed placing the dormer on the back to allow for a single large dormer screened from view.

Commissioner Blandford sought clarification on the mention of a kitchen addition. Mr. Orochena clarified that the kitchen addition was before his family bought the house. Commissioner Butler sought to confirm that the kitchen addition was on the first floor. Mr. Orochena confirmed.

Chairman Whipple expressed that the HPC wanted to work with Mr. Orochena. The HPC wants families to be able to grow in these historic homes, and it is a challenge the Commission is currently facing.

Mr. Orochena asked for next steps. Chairman Whipple stated that a formal motion would be made. Mr. Simmons explained that the Commission can put a hold or postponement on the application with the understanding that the HPC requires more information. The applicant can continue with the application, but must update the application. Mr. Simmons confirmed with the applicant that 90 days was sufficient time for changes to be made.

Chairman Whipple called for a motion for the Certificate of Appropriateness application. Motion by Commissioner Buffington to table the application for resubmittal within 90 days to allow the applicant to examine and resubmit alternative locations and size for the dormers, alternatives for the chimney removal, and to reiterate on the revised plans that the front porch will remain unchanged.

Seconded by Vice Chair Gallagher.

Chairman Whipple proceeded with a roll call for approval.

Vote taken. Motion unanimously approved 5-0. Motion carried to table the applicant request.

C. Landscaping: 2529 J. O. Stephenson Avenue

Consideration of approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by the City of Kennesaw for the removal of six trees for the rebuilding of an ADA parking lot and re-landscaping of City Hall. Case #COA2025-03.

Mr. Simmons introduced this agenda item. This is a landscaping approval for 2529 J.O. Stephenson Avenue, city hall. The consideration for approval of the Certificate of

Appropriateness was submitted by the City of Kennesaw for the removal of six trees for the rebuilding of an ADA parking lot on the front left side of City Hall and the re-landscaping of City Hall. This is a set project regarding the renovation and beautification of the City Hall facility.

Commissioner Buffington recused himself from this agenda item as his firm was selected for on call engineering services for the City of Kennesaw. The contract was put on the consent agenda during the work session on January 13th.

Mr. Ricky Stewart (Public Works Director) presented the specifics of the Certificate of Appropriateness application. This project is a pedestrian and ADA safety project. Currently the smaller parking lot to the east side of city hall cannot be used as an ADA parking lot due to root intrusion from the two oaks on Lil General Cloggers Lane. Tree removal is required to rebuild the parking lot. On the western side of City Hall, alterations will be made because the steps leading from the employee door to the parking lot have irregular steps. The last step is about three inches taller than the other steps and has resulted in falls. The sidewalk connection in that location will be removed and a planter will be put in place to act as a barrier to direct City Hall foot traffic to the street sidewalk. The sidewalk brick, which is a tripping hazard and maintenance challenge, will also be replaced. The intent is to improve pedestrian traffic, improve the ADA accessibility and improve the landscaping in front of City Hall.

Chairman Whipple asked about the status of the remaining four trees along J.O. Stephenson Avenue. Mr. Stewart responded that the remaining four trees consist of two dogwoods and two additional oaks. The oaks constantly drop acorns in the fall and have resulted in several slips despite attempts to clear acorns from the sidewalk. The oaks are native oaks. The dogwoods are non-native plantings.

Chairman Whipple asked for a walkthrough of the proposed replanting. Mr. Stewart stated that the plant list included Arborvitae and some shrubs. The Arborvitae would be placed on both sides of the main entrance into City Hall where the monument sign currently stands. Additional width will be added on either side of the monument as it enters the front door because the current sidewalk does not provide sufficient space for a wheelchair. The sidewalk corners will be mitered to widen the sidewalk for wheelchair accessibility.

Commissioner Blandford commented that the rendered plan shows more planting around the new parking area that was not visible on the landscaping plan. She asked what would be planted in the parking lot area. Mr. Stewart responded that some items shown on the rendering are existing plantings from when the parking lot side was relandscaped six or seven years ago. Those plantings include Arborvitae and shrubs.

Commissioner Gallagher commented that the plan shows an overlay on a section of J.O. Stephenson Avenue in front of City Hall, but does not show the current accessibility path on the north side of J.O. Stephenson Avenue or accessibility curving that provides that path to travel from the public right-of-way on the north side to City

Hall. He asked if those two accessibility features would be restored. Mr. Stewart stated that the features would not be restored. Currently there are three brick paver crosswalks that invites mid-block foot traffic. One has no handicap curb cuts, one has only one handicap curb cut, and the third has a curb cut but no wheelchair ramp. The renovations would direct people to cross at appropriate intersections to travel from the north side of J.O Stephenson Avenue to the south side of J.O. Stephenson Avenue. One crossing was already constructed at Dallas Street. Another will be added along Lil General Cloggers Lane once the ramp is reconfigured to receive from the corner. Vice Chair Gallagher confirmed that the intersections at Dallas and Lil General Cloggers Lane would be accessible. Mr. Stewart confirmed and added that the crossings at the intersection would be safer.

Chairman Whipple commented that no replanting was identified for the removed oaks on Lil General Cloggers Lane. He asked if only grass would be on the corner. Mr. Stewart confirmed that only grass will be on the corner.

Commissioner Bramlett asked if the planters in front of City Hall would be brick or stone. Mr. Stewart responded that the material would be brick as similar as possible to what currently exist along the front of City Hall.

Mr. Simmons commented that when the Community Development department was in City Hall, there were complaints that the two oaks along Lil General Clogger Lane created visibility issue for motorists.

Commissioner Butler commented that according to section 6.11.02 in the Design Guidelines, existing vegetation, when feasible, must be preserved, and new vegetation will be added that complements the historical character of the building. She expressed that while she understands there is a visibility issue, it seemed problematic to not replace the trees.

Vice Chair Gallagher stated he understood the necessity for removing the larger trees. He agreed with Commissioner Butler and expressed that he would like to see some replanting along Lil General Cloggers Lane to complement the prior existence of oak trees in that location. Mr. Stewart commented that replanting on the corner could be replanted, but not necessarily within the sight triangle. He also mentioned that there is a waterline administered by Cobb Water on that corner. Any planting that would reach the size of the existing oaks would not be replanted to avoid damaging the waterline. Commissioner Butler expressed that a smaller tree like the dogwoods being removed for accessibility would be sufficient size, granted they do not interfere with the waterline.

Chairman Whipple stated that the HPC was amiable to removing the trees. He summarized that the project was for the public benefit to address challenges at the front of City Hall. He added that the city should investigate understory plantings the corner of

Lil General Clogger Lane. Mr. Stewart responded that there could be a consideration for planting on the corner. If planting in that location was not feasible, the city will follow the tree ordinance, where, if the trees cannot be replaced in that area, another suitable location would be used for replanting. Chairman Whipple expressed that the HPC would be amiable to that solution.

Commissioner Blandford commented that the flagpoles are not present on the plan. She asked if there will be a flagpole at the front of City Hall. Mr. Stewart responded that there is currently one flagpole at the Council Chamber entrance. The three flagpoles at the front of City Hall would be removed and two additional flagpoles would be placed at the Council Chamber entrance. The city, state, and US flags would thus all be at the back of City Hall.

Chairman Whipple called for a motion for the Certificate of Appropriateness Application. Motion by Vice Chair Gallagher to approve with the condition that the City of Kennesaw assess the feasibility of planting along Lil General Cloggers Lane, and if planting in this location not feasible with public safety, the City will relocate planting to another location.

Seconded by Commissioner Bramlett.

Chairman Whipple proceeded with a roll call for approval.

Vote taken. Motion approved 4-0. Motion carried to approve the applicant request with conditions.

6. Discussion

Commissioner Buffington announced that his firm was selected for on-call engineering services for the City of Kennesaw. The contract was put on the consent agenda during the Mayor and Council Work Session on January 13, 2025. This will be his last HPC meeting and he will be submitting his letter of resignation to the Mayor on January 22. Chairman Whipple thanked Commissioner Buffington and expressed that it had been a pleasure serving with him on the HPC.

7. Public Comments

8. Staff Comment

Mr. Simmons stated that staff had a couple of updates. Mr. Simmons thanked the Commissioners for their work and congratulated the new officers for 2025. He also thanked Commissioner Buffington for his service and expressed that he had been an asset to the HPC and staff with his insights.

Ms. Chanelle Campbell provided an update on the HPC Survey. The survey is underway to begin in March. On February 4th, Planning and Zoning staff will be meeting with KSU students and DCA. They will be going to KSU to give a presentation on historic preservation and updating GNAHRGIS. Commissioner Bramlett asked about potentially meeting the students; Ms. Campbell shared that this was in discussion. Letters will also be mailed to properties owners in the historic district to let property owners aware of the upcoming survey.

9. Adjourn

Chairman Whipple adjourned the meeting at 9:18 a.m.