

**ATHENS-CLARKE COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
STAFF REPORT**

**APPLICATION NUMBER**..... COA-2025-12-2508

**DATE**..... January 21, 2026

**PETITIONER**..... T.H. Morris as agent for Kevin Hamman

**REQUEST**..... Replace Rear Addition

**LOCATION**..... 277 Hiawassee Avenue

**PROPERTY INFORMATION**.....Tax Parcel # 114D1 I006, Boulevard, RS-8

**RECOMMENDATION**..... Approval with Condition

**REQUEST**

Approval is requested to replace a previous rear addition with a new addition that includes a basement level.

**BACKGROUND**

Parcel Status: The property is considered a contributing resource to the Boulevard Historic District. This means that changes are reviewed for the impact to the overall district as well as to the character of this property.

Parcel History: No previous applications for Certificates of Appropriateness are on file for this property. Sanborn Maps for the area show that this structure was built by 1913 when the mapping first included this area. A rear addition five feet in depth was added across the rear of the structure by 1946 as it is visible in aerial photographs.

Lot Features: The subject property is located on the western side of Hiawassee Avenue and is the second parcel south of the intersection with Nantahala Avenue. The parcel has around 70' of lot width and about 150 feet of lot depth. The topography of the property sees a rise of about four feet from the level of Hiawassee Avenue in the front to where the house sits with a drop of eight to ten feet from the rear of the structure to the rear property line.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The request would include the removal of the previous rear addition across the back of the residence to allow for replacement with a new rear addition of greater depth that includes a basement level.

**Rear Addition Demolition:** The existing conditions include a rear addition of 5' depth that was added by 1946 that includes a bathroom and rear porch for each of the two units in the duplex structure. This addition is beyond and at a different roof slope that the shed extension behind the mansard roofline of the main area.

**Rear Addition:** The proposed new rear addition roofline would have a slight recess of about 6 inches from the corners of the existing retained structure with the south side seeing a greater recess for the wall plane due to a covered entry accessing the retained rear wall plane. A covered deck at the southwest side

of the addition extends about 10 feet beyond the 9.5' of enclosed space of the addition on the southern side while the northern side of the addition extends out 18' as all enclosed living space.

The proposed rear addition would include steps up to the deck level the extend out beyond the existing side wall plane on the south. After an 8' landing, steps down to the rear yard and basement level access would extend at about 4' width or half that of those to the east.

The addition would have a flat roofline extending from just below the eaves of the retained shed roofline. The main level of the addition would utilize vertical cementitious siding at the sides and horizontal lap siding at the rear. The basement level would be exposed smooth concrete walls.

Openings would include a single transom style window at the recessed wall plane at the southeast of the addition for the main level. The basement level would also have a transom style window but further west than that above. The right, north, elevation would also include a transom style window at each level. However, the main level transom window would be much wider and the windows would largely align at each level. The rear elevation would include a single sash casement window at the north end for both levels. A bank of three single sash windows at the recessed wall on the south side of the addition would align with a bank of three full-light doors at the basement level.

**Materials** would include:

**Roofing:** TPO flat roofing for the proposed addition. The existing roofline includes asphalt shingles for the rear shed and slopes of the mansard roof with standing seam metal at the nearly flat central portion of the mansard. Scuppers and downspouts would be used at the addition.

**Siding and Trim:** The existing structure has painted wood horizontal lap siding and wood trim. Siding for the new addition is shown as vertical cementitious boards except where shown as horizontal lap siding at the rear elevation on the elevation drawings but vertical on the oblique renderings. The applicant has clarified that vertical is the preference. Trim material to match the siding.

- The applicant has noted the applicant seeks an option to utilize refined wood product instead of cementitious product.

**Windows:** The existing windows are shown as 9-over-9 with the windows on the addition proposed as single sash. The new windows would be of aluminum clad wood construction. No changes the existing windows beyond restoration is planned.

**Doors:** The single rear entry door at the main level and the bank of three doors on the basement level are all shown as full light. The doors are to be wood.

**Porch:** The railings at the deck and steps are to be horizontal cable rail with wood posts and handrail. Decking to be wood with single corner post of wood. No changes at the front porch are planned.

**Site Changes:** The driveway shown on Sheet P-3 indicates an intention to shift the existing driveway to the north closer to the side of the house. However, the full side plan submitted shows the existing driveway retained as existing on the southern side property line. The applicant has stated....

The plans also note retaining walls to each side of the property from the existing, retained, rear corners. No information on the material or height for these walls is included. The side elevation drawings suggest low walls of about 2' height with a steeply pitched slope down to the new grade for the basement level.

## **REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION:**

Review of this application would follow the general set of Design Guidelines including Chapter 3 on Site Materials and Features, Chapter 4 on additions as New Construction, and Chapter 5 on Demolition.

	Met?	Comments
3A Parking, Drives, & Walkways	Unclear	The historic aerial photos on file appear to show the driveway as having been at the southern side as shown. The driveway is not currently discernible on the site aside from a subtle curb cut and concrete block retaining wall at the corner. It is unclear that this placement or width would comply with current requirements. It is unclear if shifting the driveway is proposed, however some degree of shifting to the north may be needed. Additional information is needed on the materials proposed and the potential to maintain the existing curb cut.
3B Fencing & Walls	Unclear	Retaining walls at the sides of the property from the addition are indicated but with no material specified and a very steep slope beyond to the new basement grade.
4F: Additions as New Construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale &amp; Massing</li> <li>• Placement &amp; Orientation</li> <li>• Materials</li> <li>• Details</li> </ul>	Mostly	The scale of the proposed addition is clearly subordinate to the existing structure. The massing is broken up somewhat on the south side of the addition but remains fairly simple. The placement at the rear and the slight recess from the historic corners is appropriate. The materials, including the two siding options, would relate to the existing but differentiate in the vertical orientation. The addition is clearly of a contemporary construction with the more modern form, materials and details.
5: Demolition	Mostly	The rear area proposed for removal is over 50 years old. However, the area is clearly a later addition using novelty siding and continuous block foundation compared to the original area having traditional lap siding and brick piers with block infill. This area does not reflect great importance or significance to the historic property. The condition of this area is not cited as related to the request for removal.

Staff finds that the proposed rear addition is highly discernible from the historic construction due to its form, materials, and details. However, it does have some relationship to the historic structure in the use of siding. The addition is subordinate with the height falling under the lowest eaves of the retained structure. The changes to the property are largely appropriate with a condition to address the concerns noted above:

- The site changes to the driveway and any retaining walls be reviewed by staff for appropriate materials, height, and placement.

This recommendation is made to address the design guidelines noted above, as well as Section 8-5-5 D (1) of the Athens-Clarke County Historic Preservation Ordinance regarding Acceptable Historic Preservation Commission Reaction to an Application for Certificate of Appropriateness.

REPORT FOR:	277 Hiawassee Ave.	
In evaluating the attached report, the following standards, which are checked, were considered in making a recommendation. Items that are not applicable are marked as such. More detailed descriptions of each item are included in the attached report.		
REVIEWED	NOT APPLICABLE	
X		1. HISTORIC USES OF PROPERTY
X		2. NECESSITY OF PROPOSED CHANGES
X		3. INTEGRITY OF HISTORIC RESOURCE
		4. THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE CHANGE WILL AFFECT:
X		A. INTEGRITY OF THE BUILDING
X		B. INTEGRITY OF THE AREA
X		5. ORIGINAL AND CURRENT USES

### 277 Hiawassee Ave. Review Worksheet

	Met?	Comments
3A Parking, Drives, & Walkways		
3B Fencing & Walls		
4F: Additions as New Construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale &amp; Massing</li> <li>• Placement &amp; Orientation</li> <li>• Materials</li> <li>• Details</li> </ul>		
5: Demolition		