



PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS FOR COFA-05-26-020272

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:	05/19/2026
Plan Status:	Active	Plan Address:	20 Dane Ln Lane BLUFFTON, SC 29910
Case Manager:	Charlotte Moore	Plan PIN #:	R610 039 00A 0358 0000
Plan Description:	20 Dane Lane (COFA-05-26-020272): A request by Applicant Ansley Manuel (Manuel Studio), on behalf of Michael and Jamie Mocny (Owners), for review of a Certificate of Appropriateness-Historic District, to allow construction of a 2-story Main Residence of approximately 3,217 SF and a 2-story Carriage House of approximately 1,088 SF located at 20 Dane Lane (Parcel R610 039 00A 0358). The property is in Old Town Historic District and is zoned Neighborhood General-Historic District (NG-HD). STATUS (06.08.2026): Concept Plan scheduled for HPRC review on June 15, 2026.		

Staff Review (HD)

Submission #: 1 Recieved: 05/19/2026 Completed:

<i>Reviewing Dept.</i>	<i>Complete Date</i>	<i>Reviewer</i>	<i>Status</i>
Beaufort Jasper Water and Sewer Review	06/12/2026	Matthew Michaels	Approved with Conditions
Comments: Comments may be provided at time of Final Plan.			
Growth Management Dept Review (HD)	06/12/2026	Charlotte Moore	Approved with Conditions
Comments:			

1. Proposed Easement: The driveway configuration will require proof of a recorded easement.
 2. Building Orientation: Per UDO Sec. 5.15.5, the front principal façade must be built parallel to the street that it faces. While the building does not technically face a street, its orientation should be similar to the adjacent house facing Lawrence Street (10 Dane Lane), unless otherwise approved by the Historic Preservation Commission.
 3. Lot Coverage Percentage: The 48.6% lot coverage calculation seems low. UDO Sec. 5.15.5.C. limits impervious lot coverage to 70% for Additional Building Types, which includes impervious areas not located under roof, including gravel driveways and sidewalks without geocell material, as well as stairs and service areas. Some of these areas may not have been included. Show how the lot coverage calculation is determined on the site/landscape plan provided with the Final Plan.
 4. Building Size / Type: The house does not read as one of the approved building types that helps to “perpetuate the character that makes Bluffton distinctive” (UDO Sec. 5.15.1.C.). The Front/South elevation most resembles a Medium House type. The Left/West elevation reflects somewhat of a Vernacular house style without the required full-façade front porch. The Right/East elevation appears as a rear elevation, and the attached Carriage House is undistinguished from the main structure other than a lower roof height.
 5. Inconsistencies between Sheets: The porch stairs on the East elevation do not match the stairs shown on the site plan, and the North elevation and the first-floor plan of the garage do not match.
 6. Service Areas: Show service areas on the elevations. Staff must confirm with the Fire Marshal that HVAC and other items at Right Elevation can remain in the proposed location.
 7. Rear Porch Elevation: Provide view of area located behind the porch screen.
-
8. Distance between Columns and Pilasters: Per UDO Sec. 5.15.6.H.1.a., columns must be spaced no farther apart than they are tall as measured from the centerline of the columns. The porch columns and the first pilaster to both the right and left exceed this spacing requirement.
 9. Tree Mitigation: It appears that up to 14 mitigation trees (at 2.5 calipers) will be required with the proposed removal of four laurel oaks ranging from 12 to 24-inches DBH. The amount of open space available may not support this number of trees, and larger caliper trees at time of planting may be necessary. A minimum of 75% tree canopy coverage at maturity is required.
 10. Final Plan Submission: Please provide a written response to the June 15, 2026 HPRC comments. Ensure that Final Plan includes required items and that conformance with UDO requirements is demonstrated on the site, architectural and landscape plans. Any items that do not conform must be identified and include an explanation in the narrative. Items identified on the project analysis sheet of the COFA application must be consistent with the architectural plans. Label all materials, windows, doors, configurations and provide dimensions, where applicable, to show compliance with the UDO. The Final Plan will not be scheduled for an HPC agenda until all required items are satisfactorily provided.

HPRC Review

06/12/2026

Charlotte Moore

Approved with Conditions

Comments:

1. Why is an Additional Building Type proposed? Are there no other building types that would work better for this property?
2. The main roof slope is too long of a span of a single plane on both the west and east elevations. Recommend stepping back the roof line over the smaller side column bays at the end of the west porch and providing more variation along the east elevation in a similar fashion. Additionally, recommend not integrating the garage roof into the main roof plane.
3. Review the proportion and lite divisions of the dormer windows. All of the other windows are 6-lite and the dormers are 4-lite. Particularly at the west elevation, the 4-lite windows are a much larger scale and proportion than the rest of the window, and either the window size or lite pattern should be adjusted.
4. A railing will be required if the front porch is 3'-0" off grade.

Watershed Management Review

06/04/2026

Samantha Crotty

Approved with Conditions

Comments:

1. If land disturbance associated with this project equals or exceeds 5,000 square feet, the project must meet SoLoCo standards. Additional information may be provided at time of building permit submittal.

Transportation Department
Review - HD

05/19/2026

Megan Andrews

Approved

Comments:

No comments

Plan Review Case Notes: