

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION



STAFF REPORT

Department of Growth Management

MEETING DATE:	June 11, 2025
PROJECT:	COFA-05-24-019155 68 Pritchard Street New Two-story Carriage House
APPLICANT:	Tony Pressley
PROPERTY OWNERS:	Tony and Alyssa Pressley
PROJECT MANAGER:	Charlotte Moore, AICP, Principal Planner

APPLICATION REQUEST: The Applicant requests that the Historic Preservation Commission approve the following:

A Certificate of Appropriateness-HD (COFA-HD) to allow the construction of a new two-story Carriage House of approximately 880 square feet. The property is in Old Town Bluffton Historic District and zoned Neighborhood General-HD (NG-HD).

INTRODUCTION: The proposed Carriage House is a two-story structure under a front-facing gable with an upper-story residence over a two-bay garage. The Carriage House will have a total of 880 square feet (a ground floor of 440 unheated square footage and second story of 440 heated square footage).

The exterior siding is proposed to be cementitious fiberboard with 6" reveal. The main roof structure, including the lean-to roof over the garage bays, as well as the awnings over the entry doors, will be standing seam metal. The Carriage House is designed to match the main house which was approved in 2017 (COFA-10-17-11416).

This project was presented to the Historic Preservation Review Committee (HPRC) for conceptual review at the June 17, 2024 meeting. Based on comments from that meeting, the Carriage House was relocated from the southern property line to the northern property line because of the grade change to Heyward Cove. The Carriage House in the revised location was not reviewed by the HPRC; therefore, the HPRC comments are for the previous location (Attachment 6).

REVIEW CRITERIA & ANALYSIS: In its review of this COFA-HD application, Town Staff and the Historic Preservation Commission are required to consider the criteria set forth in Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Section 3.18.3 (COFA-HD, Application Review Criteria), applying the standards and guidelines of UDO Sec. 5.15, Old Town Bluffton

Historic District. The intent of the standards and guidelines is, in part, to provide guidance and ensure consistent development without discouraging creativity or forcing the replication of historic models.

The applicable criteria of UDO Sec.3.18.3 are provided below followed by a Staff Finding based upon review of the application submittals to date.

1. Section 3.18.3.B. Consistency with the principles set forth in the Old Town Master Plan.

- a. *Finding.* The application is consistent with the principles set forth in the Old Town Master Plan. The Old Town Master Plan states that “The built environment, in particular the historic structures scattered throughout Old Town, should be protected and enhanced. While it is of great importance to save and restore historic structures, it is just as important to add to the built environment in a way that makes Old Town more complete.”

Old Town Bluffton Historic District is a locally designated historic district. The proposed Carriage House has been designed to be sympathetic to the architectural character of the neighboring structures and will enhance the neighborhood by adding architectural variety.

- b. *Finding.* The Old Town Master Plan initiatives also include the adoption of a form-based code that included architectural standards for structures located within the Old Town Bluffton Historic District. These standards are included in Article 5 of the UDO. The new construction proposed as part of this request will be in conformance with those standards if the conditions noted in #2 of this Section are met.
- c. *Finding.* The Old Town Master Plan initiatives also promote preservation and protection of the legacy of the Old Town Bluffton Historic District through additions to the built environment which make Old Town more complete. The addition of the proposed Carriage House contributes to the district as well as helps to provide completeness to the neighborhood and overall district.

2. Section 3.18.3.C. The application must be in conformance with applicable provisions provided in Article 5, Design Standards.

- a. *Finding.* Town Staff finds that if the conditions noted below are met, the proposed addition will be in conformance with applicable provisions provided in Article 5:
- 1) **Service Yard:** The service yard must be relocated from underneath the stairs and screened in compliance with UDO Sec. 5.15.5.F. The service

yard area must be large enough to include HVAC units, utilities and receptacles. Utility meters must be screened from public view.

- 2) **Foundation:** As the concrete foundation will be partially exposed, the foundation must match the tabby shell foundation of the main residence and must be mixed shell size per UDO Sec. 5.15.6.G.1.
 - 3) **Doors and Windows:** A door and window schedule is not provided with the plans, but the Project Analysis Sheet states that windows will be “metal,” entry doors wood, and garage doors aluminum. The type of metal to be used must be identified on the window schedule and consistent with a material permitted by UDO Sec. 5.15.6.I.2.a. The windows used for the house were “clad” single divided lites (4:1), which appears to be the same window type. Proposed door materials comply with the UDO.
 - 4) **Roof:** “Metal” is identified as the roof material on the Project Analysis form and “metal standing seam” on the plans. To be consistent with the house, galvanized material should be used and identified on the plan.
 - 5) **Corner and Water Table Trim:** The material for the corner board is shown as fiber cement board on the Project Analysis form but not identified on the plans. The plans must be revised to show this material. The water table and drip cap are shown as wood on the plans, but the house was approved with fiber cement board. Materials should be consistent.
 - 6) **Brackets:** Brackets are proposed underneath the awnings of ground and second-floor doors, as well as the front and rear gables. Details, including material, were not included and must be provided.
 - 7) **Landscape Plan:** A recent Landscape Plan was not provided with the Final Plan. The “site plan” is an overlay of the Carriage House on a survey from 2017. Since that time, trees have been removed from the property, and it is unclear what remains. One tree appears to require removal, but this must be confirmed. Further, it must be demonstrated that 75% tree canopy coverage at time of maturity (and excluding rooftops) will be provided for the entire lot, not just the disturbed area. A Tree Permit will be required to remove any tree that is 14 or more inches in diameter at breast height (UDO Sec. 3.22.2.B.3.).
3. **Section 3.18.3.D. Consistency with the nature and character of the surrounding area and consistency of the structure with the scale, form and building proportions of the surrounding neighborhood.**

Finding. Town Staff finds the nature and character of the new construction to be consistent and harmonious with that of the surrounding neighborhood. With revisions to address the items in #2 above, the Carriage House will be sensitive to the neighboring properties.

4. **Section 3.18.3.F. The historic, architectural, and aesthetic features of the structure, including the extent to which its alteration or removal would be detrimental to the public interest.**

Finding. If the conditions #2 of this report are met, the proposed plans are sympathetic in design to the neighboring historic and non-historic resources; therefore, the Carriage House with the recommended revisions, will have no adverse effect on the public interest.

5. **Section 3.18.3.H. The application must comply with applicable requirements in the Applications Manual.**

Finding. The Certificate of Appropriateness Application has been reviewed by Town Staff and has been determined to be complete except for the applicable items in #2.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: It is the charge of the HPC to assess and interpret the standards and guidelines set forth in the UDO as they pertain to applications using the review criteria established in the UDO and to take appropriate action as granted by the powers and duties set forth in Section 2.2.6.E.2. Town Staff finds that with the conditions noted below, the requirements of Section 3.18.3 of the Unified Development Ordinance have been met and recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission approve the application with the following conditions:

1. The service yard must be relocated from underneath the stairs and screened in compliance with UDO Sec. 5.15.5.F.
2. An exposed foundation must match the tabby shell foundation of the existing house and must be mixed shell size (UDO Sec. 5.15.6.G.1).
3. Provide a door and window schedule on the plans
4. The standing seam metal roof should be galvanized to match the existing house.
5. Identify the corner board material and revise the water table and drip cap to be fiber cement board to match the existing house.
6. Provide bracket details, including dimensions and material.

7. Show that a minimum of 75% tree canopy coverage at maturity will be provided for the entire lot not to include roofs.
8. Submit a Tree Removal Permit application to remove trees that are 14" or greater in diameter at breast height (UDO Sec. 3.22.2.B.3.).

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ACTIONS: As granted by the powers and duties set forth in Section 2.2.6.E.2, the Historic Preservation Commission has the authority to take the following actions with respect to this application:

1. Approve the application as submitted by the Applicant;
2. Approve the application with conditions; or
3. Deny the application as submitted by the Applicant.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Location and Zoning Map
2. Application and Narrative
3. Site Photos
4. Site Info
5. Building Plans
6. HPRC Report