



PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS FOR COFA-05-24-019155

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:** 05/24/2024
Plan Status: Active **Plan Address:** 68 Pritchard St Street
BLUFFTON, SC 29910
Case Manager: Katie Peterson **Plan PIN #:** R610 039 00A 0267 0000
Plan Description: A request by Tony and Alyssa Pressley for review of a Certificate of Appropriateness - HD to construct a new 2-story Carriage House of approximately 800 SF at 68 Pritchard Street, in the Old Town Bluffton Historic District and zoned Neighborhood General-HD.
Status: The Conceptual Application will be reviewed at the June 17, 2024 HPRC meeting.

Staff Review (HD)

Submission #: 1 Received: 05/24/2024 Completed: 06/14/2024

Reviewing Dept.	Complete Date	Reviewer	Status
Growth Management Dept Review (HD)	06/14/2024	Katie Peterson	Revisions Required

Comments:

- Elevations don't reflect the true rear elevation. There is a 3' grade difference from the front of the structure to the rear of the structure. Update the elevations to show accurate exposed slab. Note, exposed foundation materials required. (Applications Manual and UDO 5.15.6.G.1.a.)
- Rough sawn wood, plywood and aluminum are not permitted materials for soffit or cornice detailing. The Typical Garage Wall Section detail (5 on sheet G2) indicates the use of plywood in the soffit. Revise to a permitted materials. (UDO 5.15.6.P.)
- Shutters, when proposed, should be applied to all windows which can accept them. As the primary structure does not have shutters, either the shutters should be removed from the carriage house plans, or shutters included in the final submittal for the primary structure. (UDO 5.15.5.)
- Provide window and door table showing the material, side and operation. Further, window and door lite patterns should have a relationship with the primary structure. Provide additional information on proportions and revise proposed muntin pattern to have a better relationship with the primary structure. (UDO 5.15.5.F.4)
- Stairs are not shown on the site plan. Note that stairs may not be any closer than 3 feet to the property line. Should stairs be proposed on the left side, the structure will need to be relocated to accommodate the spacing. (UDO 9.3.)

HPRC Review	06/14/2024	Katie Peterson	Approved with Conditions
-------------	------------	----------------	--------------------------

Comments:

- Provide a project narrative per the application requirements. (Applications Manual)
- The carriage house plan and the footprint on the site plan do not match, further, the plans are for a different site and must be updated to be site specific (i.e. stairs oriented towards the home, not the cove, title block for same location as application indicates, etc.). (Applications Manual)
- Carriage House must be of the same general character as the primary structure, further, overall building proportions and individual building features shall have a proportional relationship with one another. The bracket over the pedestrian door on the first floor is uncomfortably high and does not relate to the head of the door below and to the detailing on the primary structure. Lower the bracket and shed roof height. (UDO 5.15.5.F.4. and 5.15.8.F.)
- During the site planning for any property, consideration shall be given to the existing tree canopy and every reasonable effort made to maximize the preservation of the existing canopy. The Carriage House is proposed within a few inches of a very large hickory. Provide additional information on how the Hickory will be preserved and protected from the impacts of the new construction, including compaction/fill of the root system. Installing a turn-down slab foundation inches from the tree is not an acceptable solution. Re-site the structure if necessary. (5.3.3.C.)

Watershed Management Review	06/12/2024	Samantha Crotty	Approved with Conditions
-----------------------------	------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Comments:

1. Proposed finished grade is shown at 17.5'. It appears this will result in as much as 7.5 feet of fill required within the ditch bank area. Provide additional information on proposed grading for fill and/or retaining wall if one is proposed as there is not enough information to complete the review.
 - a. If a retaining wall is proposed, provide Geotech and structural and slope stability analysis.
2. Provide further information on impacts of drainage patterns and storage within Heyward Cove.
3. Provide additional information for the final limits of disturbance for proposed work.
4. At time of final submittal, provide foundation finish detail. Exposed foundation walls (below the first floor elevation) shall be brick, painted brick, tabby, sand-finished or steel trowel stucco over block/concrete. Revise. (UDO 5.15.6.G.)
5. At time of final submittal, provide gutter profile and locations as they are not shown. Gutters may be half-round, square or rectangle in profile. (UDO 5.15.6.J.)
6. Update application or building plans as the square footages do not match. Application says 440 SF FP, 880 SF total, Plans show 400 SF and 800 SF. Revise.

Building Safety Review	06/06/2024	Robert Currall	Approved with Conditions
------------------------	------------	----------------	--------------------------

Comments:

1. If a retaining wall is proposed along top of bank, stamped structural plans will be required at time of building permit.

Beaufort Jasper Water and Sewer Review	06/14/2024	Matthew Michaels	Approved
--	------------	------------------	----------

Comments:

1. No comments provided by reviewer.

Transportation Department Review - HD	05/28/2024	Megan James	Approved
---------------------------------------	------------	-------------	----------

Comments:

No comments

Plan Review Case Notes: