



# ATTACHMENT 8 PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS FOR COFA-04-23-017894

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

<b>Plan Type:</b>	<b>Historic District</b>	<b>Apply Date:</b>	<b>04/12/2023</b>
<b>Plan Status:</b>	<b>Active</b>	<b>Plan Address:</b>	<b>23 Boundary Street BLUFFTON, SC 29910</b>
<b>Case Manager:</b>	<b>Glen Umberger</b>	<b>Plan PIN #:</b>	<b>R610 039 00A 0080 0000</b>
<b>Plan Description:</b>	<b>23 Boundary Street: A request by James McGhee on behalf of the owner, Campbell Chapel A.M.E. Church, for a review of a Certificate of Appropriateness - HD to demolish the non-historic, non-contributing portion of approximately 2,307 SF, to allow the construction of a 1-story free-standing addition of approximately 608 SF and to renovate the historic 1780 SF Contributing Resource known as Campbell Chapel A.M.E. located at 23 Boundary Street in the Old Town Bluffton Historic District and zoned Neighborhood Center-HD. (COFA-04-23-017894) (Staff - Glen Umberger)</b>		

## Staff Review (HD)

**Submission #: 1**      Received: 04/12/2023      Completed: 05/03/2023

<i>Reviewing Dept.</i>	<i>Complete Date</i>	<i>Reviewer</i>	<i>Status</i>
Growth Management Dept Review (HD)	05/03/2023	Glen Umberger	Revisions Required

### Comments:

#### 3.18.3 Comments

Summary: Campbell Chapel A.M.E. is individually listed in the National Register of Historic Places (2019) and has been designated as a Contributing Resource to the Old Town Bluffton Historic District. Accordingly, any alterations, additions, or renovations must be done in a manner that is consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (UDO 3.18.3.A.). This application, in part, proposes to return the subject to its 1874 configuration with the addition of shutters, recreation of "jib" doors on the side elevations, reconstruction of a former belfry with a decorative cross-shaped finial, and a roof replacement. In general, according to the Standards, "When an entire exterior feature is missing, it no longer plays a role in physically defining the historic character of the building unless it can be accurately recovered in form and detailing through the process of carefully documenting the historic appearance. If the feature is not critical to the survival of the building, allowing the building to remain without the feature is one option. A second option in a rehabilitation treatment for replacing a missing feature, particularly when the available information about the feature is inadequate to permit an accurate reconstruction, is to design a new feature that is compatible with the overall historic character of the building." As such, additional historic research will be required to document the existence of shutters and associated hardware before fabrication and installation of new shutters will be permitted. Further, additional historic research will be required to document the existence of the jib doors on the side elevation; it is possible that these were removed during the 1874-era renovation of the church and, if so, recreating these on the exterior elevations would not be in accordance with the Standards, in particular "changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved." The construction of a historic belfry does not present any major issues, however additional documentation will be required for the existence of the metal Cross/finial on top of the belfry before the installation of this architectural feature is permitted. The proposed roof replacement with wood shingles is problematic. While the original 1853 building may have had wood shingles, and wood shingles may have been present in 1874, the current metal roof (and similar metal roof that appears in the 1933 photograph) is an architectural feature that has acquired significance in its own right and therefore shall be retained and preserved.

The proposed demolition of the 1960s-era non-historic, non-contributing portion of the building presents no conflicts with the Standards. Furthermore, the Standards state that "New additions should be designed and constructed so that the character-defining features of the historic building, its site, and setting are not negatively impacted. Generally, a new addition should be subordinate to the historic building. A new addition should be compatible, but differentiated enough so that it is not confused as historic or original to the building." Accordingly, the proposed 608SF addition meets this Standard.

Growth Management Dept Review (HD)	05/03/2023	Glen Umberger	Approved with Conditions
------------------------------------	------------	---------------	--------------------------

**Comments:****ATTACHMENT 8****Article 5 Comments**

1. At time of final submittal, provide additional information on railing details as not enough information has been provided to ensure compliance with material and configuration (UDO 5.15.6.H.).
2. At time of final submittal, provide additional information on proposed exterior wood doors for front and rear elevations of historic resource as not enough information has been provided to ensure compliance with material and configuration.(UDO 5.15.6.I).
3. At time of final submittal, provide additional information for the proposed replacement windows in the historic resource and new windows in proposed rear addition as not enough information has been provided to ensure compliance with material and configuration (UDO 5.15.6.I.).
4. The Applicant has proposed wood shingles which are not a permitted material (historic resource) nor is a fully adhered membrane roof (rear portion of addition). Permitted finish materials include metal (galvanized, copper, aluminum, zinc-alum) or shingles (metal or asphalt "dimensional" type, slate, composite slate). Revise roof material to permitted material. For small flat roof area provide additional information on proposed membrane roofing. (UDO 5.15.6.J.).
5. Provide additional information on gutters and rain chains (downspouts) as not enough information has been provided to ensure compliance with the material. Gutters and rain chains (downspouts) are to match in material, including copper, galvanized steel, or aluminum (14-18 gauge). They may be square, rectangular or half-round in profile. (UDO 5.15.6.J.).
6. Provide additional information on soffit and fascia to ensure it is a permitted material (UDO 5.15.6.P).
7. Landscape has not been reviewed as part of this application. Provide additional information on landscape or a future Site Feature-HD application may be required (UDO 3.19).
8. Service yard fence height proposed at 8 feet. Fences in rear and side yards may not exceed 6 feet in height. Revise service yard height. (UDO 5.15.6.F.)

HPRC Review

05/03/2023

Glen Umberger

Approved with Conditions

**Comments:**

Note from Reviewer: I've reviewed the submission for the Campbell AME Church and have to say that off the bat, it's really refreshing to see such a high level of--and attention to--detail, especially at a Conceptual submittal.

I didn't have any comments on the existing chapel restoration, just a few notes on the proposed addition at the rear of the existing structure:

1. As a general note: The proposed addition, while innovative in its design and clearly serving as a visual cue that speaks to the different eras of design between the original church and the new addition, should at least strive to have some design elements that ground it more in the Lowcountry tradition. Consider modifications to exterior massing and/or detailing of exterior elements.
2. Detail 7/A401 shows a condition where two different materials are meeting at an outside corner--1/2" clear siding boards on one side and a board and batten application on the adjoining corner. There should be no change in materials on outside corners, so consider altering the board & batten siding to match that of the cedar or create an outside corner condition so that the board and batten siding can terminate into an inside corner. If this detail is in error, update the detail.

---

3. On the revised side and rear elevations, provide additional information regarding the intent of the parapet and flat roof for the connection.
4. Provide additional information on the 3/8" finished panel between the siding and underside of the roof as the intent is not clear. Question: Is there a specific reason vertical cedar siding has been chosen.
5. Why is there a different siding pattern shown on 1/A302? This would seem the only place this siding is used. Provide clarification.

Comment from reviewer: While the addition is clearly secondary to the primary building form, the exterior materials do not seem to be in keeping with the structure as historic as the church. It may be beneficial to provide a 3D rendering on the back half of the church with the addition so we have a better understanding of what is being requested for approval.

Transportation Department  
Review - HD

05/03/2023

Dan Frazier

Approved with Conditions

**Comments:**

1. The application materials include site changes to the stormwater, parking layout, circulation etc. that exceed the scope of work which may be reviewed as a Certificate of Appropriateness-HD. A Development Plan Amendment is required to complete these site changes prior to approval of the COFA. Should the scope of work submitted for the Final Review of this application be reduced to ONLY the modifications to the building, and not include the site changes, the COFA may be reviewed as a stand alone application. Please contact Dan Frazier (dfrazier@townofbluffton.com) to discuss the DPA process should you wish to move forward with these changes at this time. (UDO 3.18 and 3.10)

Watershed Management Review

05/02/2023

Samantha Crotty

Approved with Conditions

**Comments:**

At this time, the BMP (rain garden) in place is for the treatment of runoff from right-of-way property and is therefore maintained by the Town. Should the use of the BMP be modified to private stormwater treatment, the ownership and maintenance of the BMP will need to be permanently taken over with a signed Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Agreement in place by the private entity, as the Town cannot maintain private stormwater infrastructure with public funds. For an O&M Agreement template, see Appendix O of the SoLoCo Design Manual.

As this exceeds the COFA scope, it will be reviewed through the Development Plan Amendment process - See Transportation comments.

Beaufort Jasper Water and Sewer  
Review

05/02/2023

James Clardy

Approved

**Comments:**

No Comments

**Plan Review Case Notes:**