



# PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS FOR COFA-12-25-020072

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

**Plan Type:** Historic District **Apply Date:** 12/29/2025  
**Plan Status:** Active **Plan Address:** 204 Bluffton Rd Road  
 BLUFFTON, SC 29910  
**Case Manager:** Charlotte Moore **Plan PIN #:** R614 039 00A 0320 0000  
**Plan Description:** 204 Bluffton Road: A request by Thomas Michaels, Jr. (SM7 Design, LLC), Applicant, on behalf of 204 Bluffton Road, LLC, Owner, for review of a Certificate of Appropriateness-Historic District Concept Plan to allow the construction of a 3-story 3,978 SF Main Street Building at 204 Bluffton Road. The property is in the Promenad development in Old Town Historic District and zoned Neighborhood Core-Historic District (NG-HD). (COFA-12-25-020072) (Staff-Charlotte Moore)  
**STATUS (01.12.2026):** Concept Plan scheduled for HPRC review on January 26, 2026.

## Staff Review (HD)

**Submission #: 1** Recieved: 12/29/2025 Completed:

Reviewing Dept.	Complete Date	Reviewer	Status
Beaufort Jasper Water and Sewer Review	01/23/2026	Matthew Michaels	Approved

**Comments:**  
 Comments may be provided at time of final plan.

Growth Management Dept Review (HD)	01/23/2026	Charlotte Moore	Approved
------------------------------------	------------	-----------------	----------

- Comments:**
1. Site: Show the location of staircases and service yards for adjacent buildings on the site plan to confirm proximity from the proposed staircase and service yard. Show connection to public sidewalk. As the colonnade, service yard and staircase extend beyond the property line, an updated letter of approval addressing these items will be required from the Promenade POA. SCDOT approval required to relocate sign (if relocation needed).
  2. Brick: A light-colored brick is proposed for the columns, which is not a brick color that is common to this area. For consistency with Old Town, brick must be a Savannah Grey color (brownish-grey) with a tumbled texture (UDO Sec. 5.15.6.G.3.h.).
  3. Columns: The colonnade columns are bulky given their width (2'-6") and reduce full visibility of the storefront. Show the location of the rear porch columns on the site plan (Sheet A001).
  4. Service Yard Fence: The fence is shown to be 6'-6"; fence height must be no taller than 6 feet (UDO Sec. 5.15.5.F.9.c.).
  5. Signage: Signage is not reviewed with the COFA application. Per Section 3.19 of the UDO, a Site Feature-HD is required for any signs proposed on the site.
  6. Final Plan Submission: The Final Plan, to be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), must include all required materials, as indicated on the COFA application. A complete application includes providing a written response to these HPRC comments, identification of all materials, configurations and dimensions that are consistent with UDO requirements. If variations are sought, they must be identified in the narrative to submitted with the application. Details must include corner boards, wall section through eave, corner boards, balustrade/railings, window and door schedules, gutters, and other applicable items. Please review UDO Section 5.15 (Old Town Bluffton Historic District) for specific requirements. An incomplete submission will not be scheduled for HPC review until such time as all required items are provided.

HPRC Review	01/23/2026	Charlotte Moore	Approved
-------------	------------	-----------------	----------

**Comments:**

- 1. Height: The building appears much taller than neighboring buildings; consider lowering each story by one foot. [Note: The height to the top of the cupola is 48'-8 3/8". The height of the adjacent properties to the roof ridge are 43'-0" (202 Bluffton) and 41'-9" (206 Bluffton).]
- 2. Front Porch Entry / Columns: The front porch entry should be restudied. The columns are too tall, lack detailing and should be no taller than one-story. For a masonry application, they are also too skinny. Traditional brick masonry should visually ground a structure and provide scale. The relationship between the windows and columns should also be restudied as the windows continue past the porch.
- 3. Side Porch / Stairs: Restudy the side porch structure. The skinny deck posts are too slender and would benefit from a thoughtful cross bracing or screening detail. Related to the porch, the underside of the stairs should appear finished from the street if they are left exposed.
- 4. Rear Porch: Restudy the size of the rear porch columns which are disproportionate to the height of the porch. Consider changing the column size/design as the floors process upward.
- 5. Porch Roofs: Consider creating more interest in the porch roofs, such as adding exposed rafters.
- 6. Cupola: The cupola on the top of the roof should serve a purpose, create a unique detail, or be removed. A cupola that lacks detailing and makes more lap siding and corner boards is not appropriate. The structure is already taller than its neighbors based on its taller floor heights, so a strong argument as to why the cupola should be a part of the design is necessary.
- 7. Brackets: Front porch brackets should support a beam which supports the rafters. The beam appears to be missing. This comment also applies to the back door bracketed roof.
- 8. Windows: Restudy the window details in the brick walls. A brick header and sill detail is more appropriate to the Bluffton vernacular than wood casing. Window lites should have vertical proportions (UDO Sec. 5.15.6.I.). Consider making the square windows on the right elevation taller, even if they already meet the UDO requirement.
- 9. Doors: The Riser Room door appears to have three horizontal divides which do not match the architecture of the adjacent door.
- 10. Water Table: Consider a brick water table on the brick between floors.

Watershed Management Review	01/23/2026	Samantha Crotty	Approved
-----------------------------	------------	-----------------	----------

**Comments:**

Comments may be provided at time of final plan.

Transportation Department Review - HD	01/02/2026	Mark Maxwell	Approved
---------------------------------------	------------	--------------	----------

**Comments:**

No comments

**Plan Review Case Notes:**