



PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS FOR COFA-09-25-019927

Town of Bluffton
Department of Growth Management
20 Bridge Street P.O. Box 386 Bluffton, South Carolina 29910
Telephone 843-706-4522
OLD TOWN

Plan Type: Historic District **Apply Date:** 09/08/2025
Plan Status: Active **Plan Address:** 4 Blue Crab St Street
BLUFFTON, SC 29910
Case Manager: Charlotte Moore **Plan PIN #:** R610 039 000 1231 0000
Plan Description: A request by William Court of Court Atkins Group (Applicant) on behalf of Patrick Mason (Owner), for review of a Certificate of Appropriateness-Historic District to allow the construction of a new 2-story main house and an attached carriage house at 4 Blue Crab Street. The property is located in the Old Town Historic District in the Tabby Roads development and zoned Neighborhood General-Historic District (NG-HD).
STATUS (09.24.2025): Concept Plan scheduled for October 13, 2025 HPRC meeting.

Staff Review (HD)

Submission #: 1 Recieved: 09/08/2025 Completed: 10/05/2025

<i>Reviewing Dept.</i>	<i>Complete Date</i>	<i>Reviewer</i>	<i>Status</i>
Beaufort Jasper Water and Sewer Review	10/05/2025	Matthew Michaels	Approved with Conditions
Comments: Comments may be provided at time of building permit submission.			
Growth Management Dept Review (HD)	10/05/2025	Charlotte Moore	Approved with Conditions
Comments:			

1. Ownership/Applicant Authorization: The owner is shown as Pat Mason on the application, but Beaufort County records show Blue Crab Bluffton LLC. Update the application to show the correct property owner and provide written and signed authorization that William Court is serving as the agent/applicant.
2. Setbacks: Show the front and rear yard setback on the Composite Site Plan and the individual Site Plan.
3. Building Type: "Single Family Residential" is shown as the proposed building type, which is not a building type per the Unified Development Ordinance. Identify the building type, which must be one that is permitted in the NG-HD District (UDO Sec.5.15.5.C.). The specific building types established by district for the Old Town Bluffton are intended to "perpetuate the character that makes Bluffton distinctive" (UDO Sec. 5.15.1.C.). If an Additional Building Type is selected, identify why.
4. Carriage House / Square Footage: As Old Town Bluffton is regulated by a form-based development code, the garage/bonus room is a carriage house and must comply with the carriage house building-type requirements of UDO Sec. 5.15.8.F. An attached carriage house "must be clearly incidental to...and distinguished from the principal building form." Provide the individual square footage (footprint and total) for both the main structure and the carriage house. The carriage house is an ancillary structure, and it should be better differentiated from the main structure (on the eastern elevation, the wall is recessed only one foot from the main structure wall). Related to square footage, explain why the "storage room" on the second floor of the main structure is unconditioned.
5. Materials/Dimensions/Operations: In Section 5 of the application (Materials), for each element, provide the required materials, dimensions and operations. This information must also be shown on the architectural plans and be consistent. Some materials are not permitted per the UDO, including boral, powder-coated aluminum and composite. Your narrative, which is required with the Final Plan submission, must provide reasoning why these alternative materials are proposed and how they are the same or better in appearance and performance as permitted materials.
6. Photos: Photos were not provided as required for a Concept Plan Review (COFA Application).
7. On-street Parking: At the pre-application meeting, we discussed removal of the proposed on-street parking spaces. Was the plan not updated, or is it the intent to provide them? The Site Plan (P.02) and Sheet A2.1 do not match.
8. Screening Wall: A brick wall is shown on the east side of the house, but details are not provided. If the wall extends across property lines, an easement may be necessary that also identifies the party/parties responsible for maintenance. It appears that the wall exceeds the permitted height in the front yard; per UDO Sec. 5.15.6.K., wall height cannot exceed 42 inches and posts can be taller. Is the wall intended to serve as screen for the service yard?
9. Foundation Height: The main structure foundation is 2'-4". UDO Sec. 5.15.5.F.1.c. requires residential structure to have a "first finished floor height raised a minimum of three (3) feet above average adjacent sidewalk grade."
10. Rear Double Porch Detail: Show the interior elevations of the porch that are not visible.
11. Windows: Fixed windows are not permitted as shown on the left ground floor elevation. Per UDO Sec. 5.15.5.I.3.b. Consider changing this window to match the adjacent kitchen windows.
12. Porch Facia: The front and rear porch appear to have two fascia boards with a space in between—it's not clear why. What is the material? Porch ceiling material must be identified.
13. Second Concept Plan Review: Given the number of comments, a second Concept Plan review will be required.
14. Final Submission: At the time of Final Plan submission, provide a landscape plan showing foundation plantings and 75% tree canopy coverage at maturity (UDO Sec. 5.3.) and architectural details of the railings and balusters, door and window schedules, corner board/pilaster trim detail and sections through the eave and wall depicting the material and dimensions (Applications Manual). A response to all Concept Plan comments must be provided.

HPRC Review

10/05/2025

Charlotte Moore

Approved with Conditions

Comments:

1. Modify the front porch column spacing to comply with UDO 5.15.6.H.1.a: "Columns and porch posts shall be spaced no farther apart than they are tall as measured from the centerlines of the columns ("o.c")."
2. The small nib of hipped roof of the front elevation should be eliminated or further extruded into an appropriately scaled element. Consider simplifying the main roof mass so that the fascia matches.
3. Review the window muntin designs for consistency. There is a mix of 4-lite and 6-lite windows that do not relate well to each other.
4. Change the lower roof of the garage to a shed roof to match the roof over the man door.
5. Per UDO 5.15.8.F.: "An attached [carriage house] structure must be clearly incidental to, smaller than, and distinguished from the principal building form." The garage element is not distinguished from the principal building form. Redesign the carriage house to provide definition between these two forms that is more than just "glueing" the garage onto the rear of the house. The relationship between the carriage house and porch appears haphazard and more consideration is necessary regarding how these two forms interact.

Watershed Management Review

09/30/2025

Samantha Crotty

Approved with Conditions

Comments:

1. Comments may be provided at time of building permit/stormwater permit submittal.

Transportation Department
Review - HD

09/16/2025

Mark Maxwell

Approved

Comments:

No comments

Plan Review Case Notes: