

## **Plan Review Comments For DP-12-23-018802**

### **Sturre Engineering Response to Preliminary DRC Comments 4/18/2024**

Application Date: 12/27/2023

Comments Received: 1/26/2023

#### **Fire Department Review - Dan Wiltse**

##### *Revisions Required*

Comments:

1. Provide exhibit for Emergency vehicle circulation.

**SE Response:** See DRC Exhibit 9 of 9.

#### **Planning Commission Review - Dan Frazier**

##### *Revisions Required*

Comments:

1. Provide key for proposed uses. Not enough information to complete review.

**SE Response:** See Proposed Land Use Table on DRC Exhibit 1 of 1.

2. Provide a cross section of the proposed road showing it meets SCDOT Standards. (UDO 5.9.3.A.).

**SE Response:** Required information on the Preliminary DRC checklist has been provided with this submittal. This includes;

1. General Layout of transportation networks including access to the site, internal roadways, and access to adjacent properties.
2. A map or sketch showing the general relationship of the development to the surrounding areas with existing and proposed access roadways referenced to the intersection of the nearest primary or secondary paved roadway.

**That said we are compliant with TOB UDO & SCDOT standards for the main drive aisle and a cross section can be provided if needed to move forward to PC.**

3. For any development or redevelopment activities, regardless of the use, a minimum of twenty percent (20%) of the gross acreage shall be specifically identified and developed or preserved as open space. For any development or redevelopment activities including a residential use, a minimum of ten percent (10%) of the gross residential use acreage shall be specifically identified and developed to use as common open space and accessible to the residents or general public through deed restrictions, covenants, public dedication, or other method acceptable to the UDO

Administrator. Open space does not include utility easements, street rights-of-way, drainage ditches, and other similar areas. Provide Open Space exhibit. (UDO 5.6)

**SE Response: See Open Space Exhibit, DRC Exhibit 3 of 9.**

4. Lots 5, 8 and 12 do not meet the frontage requirements for Neighborhood General -HD General. Roads are not Common Space. Currently, the area identified as Open Space 2 is the only access to lots 5, 6 and 7, and should be identified as ROW. (UDO 5.15.5.C.)

**SE Response: Lots have been revised, all lot widths are in conformance with frontage requirements.**

5. Through lots with roads along both the front and rear parcel lines shall be discouraged. Where through lots are created, a rear-yard landscaped buffer with a minimum width of 10 feet is required. As lots 5, 6 and 7 front towards the ROW, lots 1, 2 and 3 will require 10 foot rear landscaped buffer. Architecture for Carriage Houses in future applications will require fenestration addressing rear. (UDO 5.7.4.A.6.b.)

**SE Response: Lot plan revised, NEW Lots 1 & 2 only through lots (really corner lots).**

6. 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. Provide exhibit showing protection of large trees with lot division. (UDO 5.3.3.C.)

**SE Response: Tree exhibit provided to move forward to PC, however this request is more in line with requirements of Final DRC as described on application checklist. Lots were laid out based on protection of large diameter trees. Preliminary DRC requirements are satisfied by showing existing tree canopy coverage in the provided survey and each future resident will be required per UDO to demonstrate lot coverage standards.**

7. The UDO Administrator requires landscape buffer to mitigate the adverse impacts of the incompatible land uses. Provide buffer between ROW and adjacent residential property (22 Bruin Road). (UDO 5.3.7.B.2.a.).

**SE Response: A fence is proposed to mitigate the adverse visual impacts to 22 Bruin Road to the maximum extent practicable. Fence line is depicted on Phase 1 Plan (DRC Exhibit 5).**

## **Planning Review – SR - Jordan Holloway**

### *Revisions Required*

#### Comments:

1. Confirm space for water, sewer and other ROW utilities with BJWSA.

**SE Response: BJWSA was given an opportunity to review as part of this Preliminary DRC process and did not provide any comments as shown below. All proposed utilities are laid out in accordance with current BJWSA Technical Manual Specifications. Additionally, 2 meetings were held with BJWSA design staff prior to submittal of Preliminary DRC Application to discuss conceptual planning of this site and the proposed layout is a result of those meetings.**

2. Note: No development agreement is in place for this site. It is within the Neighborhood General-HD zoning district. Remove references to development agreement throughout.

SE Response: Referenced development agreement is proposed to establish regulations for development of future lots. We can amend this to restricted covenants or any agreed up document with town staff.

3. Garage doors shall be positioned no closer to streets, squares or parks than 20 feet behind the principal plane of the building frontage. Garage doors shall not exceed 12 feet in width. Where space permits, garage doors shall face the side or the rear, not the front. Lot 14 Carriage House does not meet Carriage House requirement. (UDO 5.15.7.H.1.)

SE Response: Not Applicable.

4. Carriage Houses for Lots 6 and 7 appear to be over top of bank.

SE Response: Not Applicable.

5. Parking lots are not permitted as standalone use in NG-HD. Common Space Area 1 is parking lot. Remove. (4.3)

SE Response: No standalone parking areas are provided with this submittal.

6. Crosswalk and detectable warning devices will be required at Bruin Road intersection. (UDO 5.9.3.I.)

SE Response: Understood, to be included at Final DRC.

7. Lots 5, 6, and 7 are required to front on a street. In order to meet this requirement, especially for lot 5, the road has to be extended across the entirety of lot 5. With this extension, the total length of the road requires a turn-around area for a fire truck. The road also needs to have a correct ROW to meet a street standard.

SE Response: Not Applicable.

8. Lot 14 is labeled as Mixed Use, however no parking is provided. This lot is likely too restricted to allow a commercial use because any required parking would need to be in a parking lot with a drive aisle, etc.

SE Response: Understood, development of Lot 14 (NEW Lot 12) is not proposed at this time.

9. Roads and parking cannot count as open space. Common Space area 3 should be included as ROW as lot 8 does not meet frontage requirements.

SE Response: Understood.

10. Consider providing a different layout with less lots to meet UDO requirements and standards.

SE Response: Based on the comments provided it is unclear why this would be necessary. Based on the comments above, the only revisions to the Lot Layout Plan are extending the r/w through Lot 5, expanding it to 24' wide, and removal of Common Space Area 3. Aside from the r/w revisions, the proposed lots are in compliance with current TOB UDO standards. Additionally, these lots are equivalent in size to the lots along Pritchard St opposite of Heyward Cove and other nearby permitted subdivisions such as Tabbey

Roads, Stock Farm, Bluffton Park and other single family residences throughout the Town of Bluffton Historic District.

Due to the expansive comments, full DRC review will be required for resubmittal.

SE Response: Unclear based on provided comments what would hold this project up from receiving feedback from Planning Commission and the public. It would be ideal to hear from PC regarding the overall concept before providing a revised layout as requested in comment 10. All items identified on the Preliminary DRC Checklist were provided with this submittal.

## **Watershed Management Review - Samantha Crotty**

### *Revisions Required*

Comments:

1. Revise the narrative to include storm attenuation for the 50- and 100-year, 24-hour design storm events. (SWDM 3.5.2)

SE Response: Understood.

2. Specify the proposed BMPs, their location on the site plans, and their feasibility using the Compliance Calculator.

SE Response: Stormwater BMPs are specified as ADS Underground Detention Basins as described on the Utility Layout (Prelim DRC Exhibit 4). Full Detailed design of underground detention system will be provided with Watershed Submittal and at Final DRC.

3. Provide a complete compliance calculator (Site Data & BMP sheets).

SE Response: Full Detailed design of underground detention system will be provided with Watershed Submittal and at Final DRC. It is ideal to provide BMP specifics after Lot Layout is confirmed to move forward to PC to avoid multiple revisions through the process.

4. It appears carriage houses on lots 6 & 7 are proposed to be built in the alcove. This is not feasible. Revise plan.

SE Response: Not Applicable.

5. Include the impervious area of future houses, driveways, and carriage houses in the compliance calculator if the entire 3.58 acres are included in the LOD. If future homesites are not to be included in the LOD, revise disturbed acreage to reflect this. Additionally, revise Appendix T statement in narrative to state that all lots, regardless of disturbance or impervious area, must submit an appendix T.

SE Response: SoLoCo Compliance summary provided with this submittal. 90% coverage was assumed for Single Family Lots, 80% coverage was assumed for Mixed Use Lots.

At time of SWP submittal, provide the findings of the slope stability analysis.

SE Response: Understood. Slope Stability Analysis was provided with Preliminary DRC submittal, would be happy to discuss findings of report with Whitaker Labs and Town of Bluffton Development Staff.

7. RECOMMENDATION: Utilize a living wall in place of a traditional retaining wall.

SE Response: Will explore with Client.

#### **Building Safety Review - Richard Spruce**

*Not Required*

#### **Planning Review – Address - Diego Farias**

*Approved with Conditions*

Comments:

They need to propose street names to assign addresses to the units that are within the complex.

SE Response: Understood.

#### **Beaufort Jasper Water and Sewer Review – Matthew Michaels**

*Approved*

Comments:

No comments provided by end of review period. Comments may be provided at the DRC meeting.

#### **Police Department Review - Bill Bonhag**

*Approved*

#### **Transportation Department - Megan James**

*Approved*