

**MINUTES OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING  
CITY OF KENNESAW  
Council Chambers  
(2529 J.O. Stephenson Avenue, Kennesaw, GA 30144)  
February 20, 2026  
8:00 AM**

---

**1. Call to Order / Roll Call**

Commissioner Butler was appointed temporary Chair.

Chairwoman Butler called the meeting to order at 8:01 a.m.

Roll Call: Sharon Blandford, Andrew Bramlett, Thomas Neaves, Rachel Butler

Absent: Patrick Gallagher

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

Speakers Present: Kristin Thomas (Applicant), Chad Howie (Applicant), Jason Scheidt (Applicant, Project Designer), Jason Kisz (Project Developer)

**2. Election of Officers**

Commissioner Blandford nominated Patrick Gallagher as Chair.

Seconded by Commissioner Neaves

Vote taken, Patrick Gallagher is declared elected unanimously as Chair 3-0.

Commissioner Blandford nominated Andrew Bramlett as Vice Chair.

Seconded by Commissioner Neaves

Vote taken, Andrew Bramlett is declared elected unanimously as Vice Chair 3-0.

**3. Approval of the Meeting Minutes**

**A. Approval of Meeting Minutes: December 19, 2025**

Chairwoman Butler asked if there were any comments or modifications to the meeting minutes. Commissioner Neaves commented that the meeting minutes were thorough and commended staff for their attention to detail.

Chairwoman Butler called for a motion.

Motion to approve by Vice Chair Bramlett

Seconded by Commissioner Neaves

Chairwoman Butler proceeded with a roll call for approval.

Vote taken, motion unanimously approved 3-0. Motion carried.

**4. Financial Report**

Ms. Chanelle Campbell presented the financial report. There were no changes to the budget line for the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). The balance remains at \$23,398.

Chairwoman Butler asked if there were any comments or questions regarding the

financial report. Hearing none, she called for a motion.  
Motion to approve by Commissioner Neaves  
Seconded by Commissioner Blandford  
Chairwoman Butler proceeded with a roll call for approval.  
Vote taken, motion unanimously approved 3-0. Motion carried.

## **5. Old Business**

### **A. Addition: 2976 N. Main Street**

Consideration of approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by Kristin and Dane Thomas for an addition to the existing house located at 2976 N. Main St (2001390060). Case #COA2025-09A

Ms. Chanelle Campbell presented this agenda item. This is a revised Certificate of Appropriateness submitted for an addition to the historic home at 2976 North Main Street. The case was originally approved by the HPC on November 21, 2025, with the condition that the applicant use fiber cement siding on the addition in lieu of vinyl siding. The applicant subsequently obtained the required permits. During a field inspection, it was revealed that the overall height of the structure did not align with the approved plans. The applicant was instructed to stop construction and submit revised plans for review. There is an eighteen-inch height discrepancy between what was approved and what was constructed. Ms. Campbell announced that the applicant was available to provide additional context regarding the proposed revisions.

Mrs. Kristin Thomas stated that the addition is eighteen inches taller than originally planned and requested approval for the change. She explained that the height was the only change and that the difference was not visible from the street. She asked the Commissioners if they had any questions.

Commissioner Neaves noted that the plans stated that the eighteen-inch change was to accommodate framing conditions and code requirements. He asked Mrs. Thomas to elaborate on the discrepancy. Mrs. Thomas responded that they were initially trying to match the height for the current garage. Because it had no living area, the garage was held up by two-by-fours. As the addition is intended to be a living space, it needs a ten-inch header and to be held up by two-by-eights. She explained that the difference was due to a code requirement not reflected in the original building plans.

Commissioner Neaves did not see an issue with the additional eighteen inches. He noted that when the application last came before the Historic Preservation Commission, there was discussion that additions should be differentiated from the original historic building to not be mistaken as part of the historic building. He commented that the additional eighteen inches would further differentiate the addition because the roof height would not be exactly the same. He also commented that due to the addition's distance from the road, it was hard to tell the difference in height. He stated that he did not think the height difference was enough to put the addition out of character with the original proportions of the house.

Chairwoman Butler asked how far back the addition was from the historic portion of the

house. Mrs. Thomas responded that she did not know the exact measurements but that the plans were in the agenda packet. She stated that the addition was located at the back of the house and was a fair bit away from the original house. Chairwoman Butler asked if the historic house was the very front portion of the house. Mrs. Thomas responded in the affirmative. She oriented the Commissioners to the location of the original historic house on the floor plan.

Ms. Campbell stated that staff believes the revision is an acceptable alternative. She explained that the new addition does not visually dominate the historic structure. She added that the addition's setback from the road reduces the visual impact of the additional height while maintaining a primarily subordinate relationship to the historic structure.

Chairwoman Butler asked if there were any other comments or questions. Hearing no further comments or questions, Chairwoman Butler called for a motion.

Motion to approve by Vice Chair Bramlett

Seconded by Commissioner Neaves

Chairman Butler proceeded with a roll call for approval.

Vote taken, motion unanimously approved 3-0. Motion carried.

## **6. New Business**

### **A. New Construction: 1947, 1949, 1951 & 1955 Galt Commons**

Consideration for approval of a certificate of appropriateness application submitted by Riversbend Construction, Inc. for the construction of five houses located at 1947, 1949, 1951, 1953, & 1955 Galt Commons (20012904920, 20012904910, 20012904900, 20012904890, 20012904880). Case #COA2026-01

Ms. Chanelle Campbell presented this agenda item. This is a Certificate of Appropriateness request for the construction of five homes within the existing subdivision known as Galt Commons located along Cherokee Street. The project began in 2018 and after several revisions, construction of the subdivision was permitted. Over the years, the homes were constructed and sold, leaving the five lots vacant. On May 14, 2021, the developer submitted an application to revise the development plan for the five lots currently under consideration. The revised lots shifted the homes six feet further from Cherokee Street and reduced the overall scale of the proposed structure to better align with the established character of the historic district and surrounding street scape. According to the final plat recorded in 2022, the lot size of the remaining parcels ranges from 0.036 to 0.047 +/- acres. The front setbacks for these lots are 6.46 feet, based on the build-to line along Cherokee Street and recorded on the final plat. Ms. Campbell announced that the applicant was present and available to answer questions regarding the additional five lots. She also noted that the additional slides showed the renderings and proposed elevations for the five homes. The renderings and proposed elevations included different floor plans with additional details regarding the proposed materials and overall structure for the lots. Photos were shown that reflected the current conditions on the site, including surrounding buildings.

Mr. Chad Howie stated that the remaining five lots were part of the original development. He explained that the elevations presented had been previously approved, but the Certificate of Appropriateness had expired. He stated he was requesting renewal of the Certificate of Appropriateness. He further explained that the builder had decided to hold off on building the final lots due to challenging economic and housing conditions. Because conditions were looking more positive, he stated that they would like to proceed with building the houses on the remaining lots.

Vice Chair Bramlett asked if the elevations were different than what was previously submitted and approved. Mr. Howie responded that the only difference is a reduction in height due to eliminating a bedroom. He stated that the elevations were otherwise identical to what was originally proposed and that all the proposed elevations currently exist in the subdivision. Vice Chair Bramlett asked if the elevations matched the elevations on the lots behind them. Mr. Howie responded that the elevations were similar on the sides and rear. He explained that the front elevations are more appropriate to the existing elevations along Cherokee Street is the difference.

Commissioner Neaves asked if the houses would be oriented with the garage in the rear. Mr. Howie responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Neaves asked if the distance between the homes was greater than the homes immediately across the internal street. Mr. Howie responded that the space between units was not much different. He explained that the distance between units complied with building code and fire code regarding the distance between structures. Commissioner Neaves asked if there would be a fence in between each unit. Mr. Howie responded in the affirmative. He stated that it was for safety for pedestrians along Cherokee Street due to a significant slope.

Vice Chair Bramlett asked how the setback line compared to the property next door. He asked if it was similar. Mr. Howie responded that his understanding was that it was not similar. They completed a sympathetic setback line study along Cherokee street from the Frozen Creamery location to the end of the historic district. Mr. Howie stated that the proposed houses were approved by the Historic Preservation Commission and Mayor and City Council for an approximately six-foot setback, which is an average of the distance between the house and the edge of the curb for all houses along Cherokee Street. Mr. Howie added that his understanding was that the adjacent development was set further back due to concerns from Mayor and Council. Ms. Campbell stated that Mr. Howie was correct. She noted that when the adjacent development came before Mayor and Council, there was concerns about line of site due to the curb. She explained that the setbacks for the adjacent property extended beyond Mr. Howie's property to reflect the concern. The average build-to line for Mr. Howie's property is 6.46 feet while the neighboring development has a twenty-one foot setback. Commissioner Neaves asked how the setback compares with the historic home on the property. Mr. Howie responded that the historic house was one of the closest to the street at approximately 5.8 feet. He stated that the proposed houses are set back a little bit further than the historic home. He reiterated that the setback is an average of all the houses along

Cherokee Street.

Chairwoman Butler called for a motion.

Motion to approve by Commissioner Blandford

Seconded by Commissioner Neaves

Chairwoman Butler proceeded with a roll call for approval. Vote taken, motion unanimously approved 3-0. Motion carried.

**B. Central Business District Project Application: 3033, 3045, & 3059 Cherokee Street**

Consideration to review the sixty (60) percent design submittal of a Central Business District (CBD) project application submitted by Jason Kisz for the construction of a mixed-use development at 3033, 3045, & 3059 Cherokee Street (20012900960, 20012900950, 20012900940). Case #CBD2024-03

Ms. Chanelle Campbell presented this agenda item. This is a Certificate of Appropriateness application for 3033, 3045, and 3059 Cherokee Street. This development has gone through the Central Business District (CBD) process and has been reviewed by the HPC. At its December 20, 2024, meeting, the HPC heard and approved the application with the condition that the final design plans be brought back before the Commission at 60 percent for review and 100 percent for approval in addition to any landscaping plans. The applicant then returned on September 19, 2025, with updates to their site design. The HPC made the following comments on the application at its September 2025 meeting:

1. The applicant will incorporate comments about the connectivity to the sidewalks between units twelve and six with Galt Commons and
2. The applicant will incorporate landscape comments about the shrubbery on the southern property line as it pertains to connectivity with Galt Commons
3. The applicant will incorporate landscape comments about trees between units and the curb at units nine and twelve and in the parking lot.

The applicant has since submitted updated plans regarding the comments that were made. The applicant is seeking approval to move forward with obtaining their site approval for their Land Disturbance Permit (LDP) to begin construction on the site. Ms. Campbell yielded to the applicant to allow them to speak on their application.

Mr. Jason Scheidt stating that he would be discussing the project. He addressed the HPC's comments relating to connectivity with the Galt Commons subdivision. Mr. Scheidt stated that the connectivity issues was put up to a vote by the Galt Commons residents. The residents voted to not connect the developments. He explained that while the front sidewalks along Cherokee Street will be connected and the green spaces will align, the green spaces will not be formally connected. He stated that there could be some fences between the developments if needed but the green space was currently an open area. He restated that there were no official connections with Galt Commons beyond the Cherokee Street sidewalk. Mr. Scheidt then addressed the comments relating to trees and shrubs. He explained that the site was fairly tight due to a twenty-one-foot front setback. He stated that trees and shrubs on the plans are where

they have to be given the location of underground infrastructure.

Chairwoman Butler commented that there was a lot of hardscape at the front piece of the plaza. She asked if the applicant would think about placing potted vegetation at that location. Mr. Scheidt responded that they wanted the spaces to be activated with nice commercial tenants and feel like outdoor rooms where people can sit and hang out. Chairwoman Butler asked if there was a landscape plan included with the application packet. Mr. Scheidt responded that while they had submitted a tree plan, they had not yet done a full hardscape and landscape plan. He stated that those plans would probably be presented the next time they came before the Commission.

Commissioner Neaves stated that at the previous meeting he explicitly asked about tree coverage in the front, southeast parking lot close to unit nine. He asked if site utilities and sewer was preventing placing additional trees in the area. Mr. Scheidt clarified where the Commissioner was referring to. Commissioner Neaves further commented that it appeared the other parking areas had trees. He asked if there was a particular reason why trees were not placed at the parking area close to unit nine. Mr. Scheidt responded that the reasoning was likely infrastructure. Commissioner Neaves stated that he did see a sewer line in the area on the plans. Mr. Scheidt further commented that they had not finalized the placement of external electrical boxes and needed some flexibility on the site.

Commissioner Neaves commented that at the previous meeting Commissioner Butler commented on the shrubs between units six and twelve. He stated that there was discussion of those shrubs being removed from the plans to support a more informal connection. He also stated there was discussion about trying to match the grade and noted that there was a retaining wall shown on the site plan. Mr. Scheidt responded that the retaining wall is actually on the Galt Commons property and recessed in. Because the wall is not flush with the property line, they cannot control the dead space between the retaining walls because it is not their property. Mr. Scheidt also commented that they were happy to add or take out shrubs based on the HPC's decision. He stated that there were topographical differences between the sites. He noted that the greens will align and the vistas will align, but there will be a gap between the two retaining walls. Commissioner Neaves sought clarification on the placement of the two retaining walls. Mr. Scheidt responded that there would be a gap between the Galt Commons retaining wall and their retaining wall to allow stormwater to run through the channel. Commissioner Neaves responded that he did not realize the space was planned for stormwater discharge. He asked for additional information about the situation given previous conversations about an informal pedestrian connection between the paved parking areas for units two through nine and the drive on the Galt Commons Property. Mr. Scheidt responded that the retaining wall does not come all the way to the property line and there is a topographical change. Commissioner Neaves commented that it did not sound like there would be informal connection for pedestrians. Mr. Scheidt responded that the Commissioner was correct. Commissioner Neaves asked if the retaining walls had to be placed in that location and if the grades absolutely could not

match up. Mr. Jason Kisz responded that pedestrian connectivity was not possible in that area because of topography differences. He explained that the property steps down multiple times from and that each step down was ten feet. He stated that the only available spot for an informal connection was the back left corner, which was denied by the Galt Commons residents. Mr. Chad Howie further explained that it would be virtually impossible to use the retaining wall as connection points because they are the foundations of the houses. He stated that in some places the property line was up to thirteen feet away from the retaining wall.

Mr. Howie sought to explain the connection issue between Galt Commons and the proposed development. He explained that the Galt Commons HOA, which is controlled by the developer, put the decision whether to connect up to a vote by the residents. All residents voted and a majority voted for no connection between the two communities. Mr. Howie stated that in all the approvals for Galt Commons, the community has approval to construct a fence between the two developments. He explained that once three of the final five lots on Galt Commons were sold, the HOA would transfer to a board controlled by the residents. He assumed that when that occurred, the HOA would construct the fence. He expressed that residents did not want the communities to be connected. He reiterated that informal connection between the two properties was challenging from a topographical perspective, that the community voted against connection, and that the community has a right to put a fence between the two properties.

Commissioner Neaves thanked Mr. Howie for the context. He asked if the HOA had been turned over to the residents. Mr. Howie responded that the HOA had not yet been turned over to the residents. He explained that when two or three of the five lots were sold and closed on, the HOA would be transferred to the residents. He explained that in the interim, a board was formed that makes recommendations to the HOA. The community has representation through the board and anything they recommend within reason is approved. He noted that the HOA was not making daily decisions but that the newly appointed group of residents was.

Vice Chair Bramlett commented that there had been past discussion about a trail going around the retaining wall in the back. He stated that he did not see the trail in the plans. He asked if the trail had been removed due to safety issues. Mr. Kisz responded that the discussion was about putting a trail around the detention pond. He stated that the only safety issue discussed was with Council member Jones, who asked for a fence to be placed around the detention pond. Chairwoman Butler asked if the walkway was still planned. Mr. Kisz responded that nothing had changed in the plans. Commissioner Neaves asked if the walking path was shown on the plans. Mr. Kisz responded that it was and that the plans had not changed. He described the path as going around the detention pond. Mr. Scheidt stated that the path would not be paved. Commissioner Neaves asked if the walking path was explicitly noted on the plans. Mr. Kisz responded in the affirmative and stated that they have not changed the plans for that portion.

Commissioner Neaves commented that he did not see any internal sidewalk

connections leading to the dog park. He stated that he saw sidewalks across the street near units thirty-nine to forty-one, but did not see a crosswalk or sidewalk on the dog park side. He asked for additional information about the absence of sidewalks near the dog park. Mr. Scheidt responded that to maximize the space for the dog park, it was pushed to the edge of the curb. He indicated on the site plan where the gate and fence for the dog park would be located. He stated that a four-foot strip of sidewalk could be placed leading to the gate. Commissioner Neaves asked if the four foot strip would run parallel to the street. Mr. Scheidt responded that the strip would run across the street from the corner of the sidewalk for units thirty-nine to forty-one to the dog park. Commissioner Neaves asked if there was going to be a pad where the gate was going to be. Mr. Scheidt responded in the affirmative. Commissioner Neaves asked if the sidewalk would have any striping on the street. Mr. Scheidt responded that they could add striping.

Chairwoman Butler commented that she saw a twelve-foot access gate near the stormwater management area. She asked if the gate was twelve feet high or twelve feet wide. Mr. Scheidt responded that the gate was twelve feet wide for maintenance of the stormwater.

Chairwoman Butler asked if the grease traps shown on the plans were just for the commercial buildings. Mr. Scheidt responded in the affirmative.

Chairwoman Butler asked if there were any other questions or comments. Hearing no additional questions or comments, she called for a motion.

Motion by Commission Blandford to approve with the condition that a four-foot wide walkway be placed between the curb and the dog park.

Commissioner Neaves amended the motion to include the condition that pedestrian striping be placed between the dog park and the sidewalks adjacent to units 39 through 41.

Seconded by Commissioner Neaves

Chairwoman Butler proceeded with a roll call for approval.

Vote taken, motion unanimously approved 3-0. Motion carried.

Ms. Campbell clarified that the application was the site plan review at sixty percent. She explained that the next steps for the applicant would be to pull their site review and go through Cobb Fire. She stated that the application will next come before HPC prior to the issuance of building permits. Commissioner Neaves asked if the submission would include elevation drawings and other related materials. Ms. Campbell responded in the affirmative.

## **7. COAA Approval by City Staff and HPC Chair**

### **A. COAA2025-23 - 2908 Moon Station Road**

This is an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness submitted by Kevin Lares for the installation of a fence at 2908 Moon Station Road. This was administratively approved on December 30, 2025.

## B. COAA2026-01 - 2255 Lewis Street

This is a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by Joseph Bozeman for a roof replacement at 2255 Lewis Street. The application was administratively approved on February 6, 2026.

### **8. Discussion**

Vice Chair Bramlett announced that the Atlanta Preservation Center would be holding its Phoenix Flies walking tours on March 21. He stated that the Historic Preservation Commission will have a tour of downtown that day at 10 a.m. He stated that tickets would be going on sale at 10 a.m and encouraged people to register for the free walking tour. He also encouraged people to check out the other Phoenix Flies walking tours, which were also free.

Commissioner Neaves stated that he attended the Mardis Gras pop up at the pocket park next to the pedestrian tunnel. He expressed that it was a nice event and encouraged people to check out what is going on in downtown Kennesaw.

### **9. Public Comments**

Chairwoman Butler opened the floor for public comment. Hearing no public comment, she closed the floor to public comment.

### **10. Staff Comment**

Ms. Chanelle Campbell provided the Commissioners with an update regarding the Historic Design Standards. She stated that staff's goal was to have it completed in the second quarter. She stated that staff prepared a timeline to go over the ordinance changes and that a timeline would be provided internally to the HPC. Ms. Campbell explained that additional minor changes were caught by staff after the HPC's December discussion that need to be reviewed. Once staff reviews the changes, the next step would be a town hall meeting to discuss the changes with residents followed by an official vote by the HPC. Ms. Campbell reassured the Commissioners that the changes would be a priority for staff in the second quarter. She stated that the Commissioners would be receiving a timeline regarding the updates and encouraged commissioners to share any additional comments with staff.

Ms. Campbell reminded the Commissioners of the availability of funding for training. She asked the Commissioners to let staff know if there were any trainings they were interested in. She explained that training is a requirement of servicing on the HPC. She asked the Commissioners to let staff know if they see any opportunities and stated that staff would assist with registration.

### **11. Adjourn**

Chairwoman Butler adjourned the meeting at 8:45 a.m.