



# ATTACHMENT 7

## PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS FOR COFA-05-22-016741

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:** 05/12/2022  
**Plan Status:** Active **Plan Address:** 3 Wharf St  
BLUFFTON, SC 29910  
**Case Manager:** Katie Peterson **Plan PIN #:** R610 039 00A 0149 0000  
**Plan Description:** A request by Pearce Scott Architects, on behalf of the owner, Keshanya Cleveland for review of a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow the renovation of the 553 SF to the one-story, single-family residential Contributing Resource, known as the Corinne Heyward Home, and addition of 143 SF to the same structure, located at 3 Wharf Street in the Old Town Bluffton Historic District and zoned Neighborhood General-HD.  
  
**STATUS [5/16/2022]:** The application is currently being reviewed by Staff for conformance with the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), Traditional Construction Patterns, and any development plans associated with the parcel and is scheduled for review by the HPRC at the May 6, 2022 meeting.

### Staff Review (HD)

**Submission #: 1** Received: 05/12/2022 Completed: 06/03/2022

Reviewing Dept.	Complete Date	Reviewer	Status
Growth Management Dept Review (HD)	06/01/2022	Glen Umberger	Approved with Conditions

**Comments:**

1. Summary: If there is a substantial loss of historic integrity based on the Secretary of the Interiors criteria, 3 Wharf Street may potentially no longer be considered a Contributing Resource and would not be eligible for the grant program.

Technical background: The “Corinne Heyward Home,” (3 Wharf Street) is a contributing resource to the Old Town Bluffton Historic District. Such resources possess a high level of historic integrity, or an ability to convey its historic associations or attributes. There are seven aspects or qualities that define historic integrity as defined by the Secretary of the Interior:

1. location (the place where the property was constructed);
2. design (combination of architectural features that create a particular style);
3. setting (physical environment);
4. materials (physical elements);
5. workmanship (construction methods and craftsmanship);
6. feeling (aesthetic or sense of a particular period of time); and,
7. association (direct link between historic event or person and the property).

Most, if not all, of these aspects must be present for a structure to retain its historic integrity and remain “contributing” to the Old Town Bluffton Historic District and be eligible to participate in the Town of Bluffton Historic Preservation Grant Program. It is important that any repairs or alterations made to the contributing resource do not have a negative effect on its historic integrity. (UDO 3.18.3.A)

2. The owner proposes to repair and replace historic members, construct a new rear addition, and add modern conveniences which may have a negative impact on its design, materials, workmanship, and feeling.

In particular, most, if not all of the vernacular methods of construction used by William Frazier in 1926, e.g., techniques used in the construction of exterior walls, roof, and porch (workmanship) will be lost and replaced with modern construction during this project, which may be detrimental to the historic integrity.

Additional information, including a preservation plan showing the specific areas to be retained, is required as not enough information has been provided to assess historic integrity. (UDO 3.18.3.A)

3. To maintain the greatest amount of historic integrity, as many of the original materials as possible should remain intact during the project. (UDO 3.18.3.E and F)

4. If any original materials are removed during demolition that remain viable (e.g., brick from the foundation piers), they should be reused in the replacement of new members. (UDO 3.18.3.A and G)

5. The proposed new roof appears to match the old in design and materials, which is acceptable, but the new porch should also match the existing porch in design, particularly in the replication of the knee-walls which will help convey the feeling of a lowcountry cottage from the late-1920s. (UDO 3.18.3.E.)

6. While the new rear addition would generally be detrimental to historic integrity, in this case, the proposed addition is acceptable. In the end, the chief goal would be to have a structure that closely matches the original in design, mass, and scale using appropriate in-kind materials. (UDO 3.18.3.E.)

Note: See Growth Management – Katie Peterson comments for additional details required at final submittal.

Growth Management Dept Review (HD)	06/03/2022	Katie Peterson	Approved with Conditions
------------------------------------	------------	----------------	--------------------------

#### Comments:

1. Corrugated metal roofs are not permitted by the Unified Development Ordinance, however, as this structure is a Contributing Resource with an existing corrugated metal roof, the UDO Administrator finds this to be appropriate use of the material. The HPC will need to make a determination on the appropriateness of corrugated metal as a substitute for those materials listed in Section 5.15.6.J. of the UDO when the final application is presented before them. (5.15.6.A.)
2. Floor plans show both windows on the Right Elevation as the same size, the elevations for existing show same size, but the elevations for the proposed show the window towards the front as a smaller size. Additionally, the window towards the rear has conflicting lite patterns on the existing and proposed elevations. Clarify proposed windows on floor plans and elevations. (UDO 5.15.6.I.)
3. The height of the structure has been increased on the proposed drawings, provide additional information on the amount of increase and the trim detailing to allow for the increase. (Applications Manual)
4. At time of final submittal, provide additional information regarding the trim detailing along the eave as it appears to differ from the detailing of the existing structure. (Applications Manual)
5. Provide additional information on which portion of the materials will be able to be reused from the existing structure as not enough information has been provided to fully understand the extent of the new vs. reused material. (Applications Manual & UDO 3.18.3.G)
6. As the project moves toward Final submittal, provide a landscape plan noting foundation plantings, canopy coverage, street trees, typical window detail, a railing detail, a corner board detail, and a section through the exterior wall and eave for all three portions of the structure as not enough information was provided in submittal to review these items for conformance with the UDO. (Applications Manual)

Beaufort Jasper Water and Sewer Review	06/03/2022	James Clardy	Approved
--	------------	--------------	----------

#### Comments:

1. No comment

HPRC Review

06/03/2022

ATTACHMENT 7

Katie Peterson

Approved

**Comments:**

1. No comments at this time.

Transportation Department Review  
- HD

06/02/2022

Constance Clarkson

Approved

**Comments:**

No comments provided by reviewer.

Watershed Management Review

05/25/2022

Lidia Delhomme

Approved

Addressing Review

05/13/2022

Nick Walton

Approved

**Plan Review Case Notes:**