

May 1, 2025

Town of Bluffton South Carolina
Department of Growth Management
20 Bridge Street
P.O. Box 386
Bluffton, South Carolina 29910

Attn: Sam Barrow

RE: Plan Review comments for COFA-03-25-019625

Project Name: Chase Bank

Plan Address: 15 Towne Drive

Bluffton, South Carolina 29910

Plan Type: Highway Corridor Overlay District

Apply Date: 03/04/2025

Plan Status: Active

Plan Pin # R610 031 000 1085 0000

DECPC: 2521-24-02852

Dear Mr. Barrow,

On behalf of our client, BDG Architects, please find our responses to your comment letter dated April 4, 2025. The responses have been provided in bold for your reference.

Planning Commission Committee Review

Submission #1 Received 4/4/2025 Completed:

Reviewing Department – Building Safety Review

Complete Date: 04/04/2025

Reviewer: Marcus Noe

Status: Approved with Conditions

Comments:

Comments may be provided at time of Final Plan submission.

Response: Acknowledged.

Growth Management Department Review (HD)

Complete Date: 4/4/2025

Reviewer: Charolette Moore

Status: Approved with Conditions

Comments:

1. It would be helpful for the Planning Commission to see building elements that will be removed/changed/added, including roof top equipment.

Response: Please see added existing and proposed floor and roof plans on sheet A00.1. All rooftop equipment is being removed and replaced with ground mount units. Refer to equipment enclosure labeled on sheets A00.1, A00.2, A00.3, A00.4, A00.5, A00.6 and A00.7.

2. The “Northeast” photo provided is of the dumpster instead of the rear of the building. Provide a photo of this elevation.

Response: Please see updated NE photo added to sheet A00.4 .

3. The roof color is proposed to change from dark brown to black, and black is also proposed as an accent color (coping, canopies, dumpster fencing. The ATM is outlined in a bright blue. Per Sec. 5.14.3. “[p]redominant color design shall be compatible with Lowcountry or coastal vernacular palette which include traditional historic colors, earth tones (greens, tans, light browns and terracotta), grays, pale primary and secondary colors (with less than 50 percent color value), white and cream tones, and oxblood red. Accent color design (i.e., black, dark blue, grays, and other dark primary colors) may be used on a limited basis as part of an architectural motif...” Further, “high contrast” and primary colors are not permitted. The Planning Commission will need to determine if the proposed color palette is acceptable.

Response: Acknowledged. Yellow primary color has been removed from roof rails on sheet A00.7. The planning commission will need to determine if black is acceptable for coping; roof, as mentioned in comment above.

4. Provide window and door details.

Response: Please see added window and door details on sheet A00.8.

5. To the extent practicable, the screening of any rooftop equipment is recommended. As presently exists, the current configuration would not be allowed for a new building.

Response: All rooftop equipment has been removed, no additional screening will be required. Please see equipment enclosure labeled on sheets A00.1, A00.2, A00.3, A00.4, A00.5, A00.6, and A00.7.

6. Provide lighting details (proposed fixtures, light source and illumination levels—minimum, average and maximum) that show compliance with the Belfair PUD requirements (Sec.4.23.3). Include wall packs.

Response: Please see updated photometric sheet E1.0 and attached lighting cut sheets provided.

7. The Landscape Plan shows some trees to be preserved and protected, and other trees have no notations (landscaped islands adjacent to building, for example, but the narrative states otherwise). It must be clear if which, if any, trees are proposed to be removed. The Landscape Plan must also show light post locations.

Response: A tree disposition plan has been provided to detail the number and size of the trees to be removed see Sheet TD-1. Additionally, the landscape plans show the existing light locations. The location of the proposed light fixture is included in the revised landscape plans see Sheet LP-1.

8. The existing dumpster screen appears not to match the location shown on the plan. It appears that the dumpster pad was expanded. Is the plan to reduce the pad?

BDG Response: A New smaller dumpster is being proposed to replace the existing dilapidated dumpster. Please see sheet A00.5 and the previously submitted Civil Plans see sheet C1.00.

Reviewing Department – Planning Commission Review

Complete Date: 04/04/2025

Reviewer: Angie Castrillon

Status: Approved with Conditions

Response: Acknowledged.

Reviewing Department – Addressing Review

Complete Date: 04/04/2025

Reviewer: Diego Farias

Status: Approved

Response: Acknowledged.

Reviewing Department – Beaufort Jasper Water and Sewer

Complete Date: 04/04/2025

Reviewer: Matthew Michaels

Status: Approved

Response: Acknowledged.

Reviewing Department – Police Department Review

Complete Date: 04/04/2025

Reviewer: Bill Bonhag

Status: Approved

Response: Acknowledged.

Reviewing Department – Transportation Department Review

Complete Date: 04/04/2025
Reviewer: Mark Maxwell
Status: Approved

Comments may be provided at DRC meeting.

Response: Acknowledged.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Dynamic Engineering Consultants, PC

Michael D. Miles, P.E.
Regional Manager/Sr. Principal