



PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS FOR COFA-09-25-019925

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:** 09/05/2025
Plan Status: Hold **Plan Address:** 2 Blue Crab Street
BLUFFTON, SC 29910
Case Manager: Charlotte Moore **Plan PIN #:** R610 039 000 1232 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 2 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: 09/05/2025 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 review.

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. 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?
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? Consider moving the service yard farther into the property or in the rear.
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. Roofline: The left elevation, which will be visible from Wild Spartina, shows a variety of rooflines that is inconsistent with UDO Sec. 5.15.5.F., which states that "[r]ooflines shall be simple [and] correspond to the major massing of the building;...complicated rooflines are to be avoided."
11. Double Porch Detail: Show the interior elevations of the porch that are not visible.
12. Windows: Fixed windows are not permitted as shown on the right ground floor elevation. Per UDO Sec. 5.15.5.I.3.b. Consider changing this window to match the adjacent dining and kitchen windows.
13. Shutters: Some windows that can accept shutters do not have them.
14. Gutters: Gutters are indicated on the application but not shown.
15. Second Concept Plan Review: Given the number of comments, a second Concept Plan review will be required.
16. 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, floor sections, 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. This is the same model home four times in a row with very slight roof form differences and a nominal difference in siding application. The chimney is in two different locations, but it is prominently in the same location twice. All have the exact same porch including the front door – window – bedroom door arrangement. Each home should take on a more unique character to provide variety on the streetscape. Use the porch detailing to further separate these homes. Vary column spacing, column design, handrails, door design, fenestration, etc. to create variety along the streetscape. Per UDO Sec. 5.15.5.3.a.: “Buildings shall incorporate interruptions and variety into the wall plane to create interest and variety in the streetscape while still maintaining a consistent architectural style and connection to its surroundings. Examples include but are not limited to offsets, recessed entrances, arcades, awnings and canopies, bay windows, roof overhangs, expression lines, shadow lines, porches and balconies.”
2. 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”).”
3. The dormers on the front elevation lack sufficient scale. They are too widespread, which creates an uncomfortable, unfinished appearance. Restudy the spacing of these dormers in conjunction with the columns. Consider three dormers with a tighter relationship or a single larger dormer. Vary the design from 6 Blue Crab.
4. The window in the dormer on the left carriage house elevation appears to go into the roof.
5. The chimney floating in the middle of the front roof forms is uncomfortable and lacks intention. Flip the chimney to the side property line or provide alternate venting solutions for the fireplace.
6. Consider folding shutters on the left side ground floor elevation for the two outer shutters to avoid an inconsistent appearance with other shutters on the same elevation.
7. Consider adding gable vents on front and right elevations; the other two elevations have windows in those areas to help with that empty space.
8. 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.
9. 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 of the carriage house and porch is haphazard. It does not appear consideration was given to 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: