



Historic Preservation Review Committee Meeting

Monday, September 14, 2026 at 4:00 PM

Theodore D. Washington Municipal Building, Henry “Emmett” McCracken Jr. Council Chambers,
20 Bridge Street, Bluffton, SC

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

IV. OLD BUSINESS

V. NEW BUSINESS

1. **28 Stock Farm (Certificate of Appropriateness):** A request by Chris Collins of Shoreline Construction (Applicant), on behalf of Gary and Dot Jeger (Owners), for the review of a Certificate of Appropriateness-HD to allow the construction of a new 2-story Residence of approximately 3,039 SF and an attached Carriage House of approximately 1,434 SF to be located at 28 Stock Farm Road, Lot 33 in the Stock Farm Development in Old Town Bluffton Historic District, within the Neighborhood General - HD zoning district. (COFA-08-26-020439) (Staff - Charlotte Moore)

VI. DISCUSSION

VII. ADJOURNMENT

NEXT MEETING DATE: Monday, September 21, 2026

“FOIA Compliance – Public notification of this meeting has been published and posted in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and the Town of Bluffton policies.”

In accordance with the requirements of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"), the Town of Bluffton will not discriminate against qualified individuals with disabilities on the basis of disability in its services, programs, or activities. The Town of Bluffton Council Chambers are ADA compatible. Auditory accommodations are available. Any person requiring further accommodation should contact the Town of Bluffton ADA Coordinator at 843.706.4500 or adacoordinator@townofbluffton.com as soon as possible but no later than 48 hours before the scheduled event.

Executive Session – The public body may vote to go into executive session for any item identified for action on the agenda.

**Please note that each member of the public may speak at one public comment session and a form must be filled out and given to the Town Clerk. To submit a public comment online, please click here:*

<https://www.townofbluffton.sc.gov/FormCenter/Town-15/Public-Comment-60>

Public comment is limited to 3 minutes per speaker.



PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS FOR COFA-08-26-020439

Section V. Item # 1.

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:** 08/13/2026
Plan Status: Active **Plan Address:** 28 Stock Farm Road
BLUFFTON, SC 29910
Case Manager: Charlotte Moore **Plan PIN #:** R610 039 000 1510 0000
Plan Description: A request by Chris Collins of Shoreline Construction (Applicant), on behalf of Gary and Dot Jeger (Owners), for the review of a Certificate of Appropriateness-HD to allow the construction of a new 2-story Residence of approximately 3,039 SF and an attached Carriage House of approximately 1,434 SF to be located at 28 Stock Farm Road, Lot 33 in the Stock Farm Development in Old Town Bluffton Historic District, within the Neighborhood General - HD zoning district.
STATUS (09.01.2026): Concept Plan to be reviewed at 09.14.2026 HPRC meeting.

Staff Review (HD)

Submission #: 1 Received: 08/13/2026 Completed: 09/11/2026

Reviewing Dept.	Complete Date	Reviewer	Status
Beaufort Jasper Water and Sewer Review	09/11/2026	Matthew Michaels	Approved with Conditions

Comments:

Comments may be provided at time of Final Plan review.

Growth Management Dept Review (HD)	09/11/2026	Charlotte Moore	Approved with Conditions
------------------------------------	------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Comments:

1. Stock Farm HARC Approval: Has the HARC provided Preliminary Plan approval (including site, landscape and building design per Stock Farm Covenants 3.2)? At time of Final Plan submission, provide documentation from HARC that is supported.
2. UDO Compliance: The submission is for a Concept Plan, but the application notes it as a Concept Plan and Final Plan. While Final Plan requirements can be provided at the Concept Plan stage, please note that this submission would not have satisfied Final Plan requirements as it appears that the architect did not reference the UDO (specifically, Section 5.15, the design standards for Old Town Historic District). There are multiple elements that are not in compliance, including but not limited to: use of fixed and slider windows (UDO Sec. 5.15.6.I), sliding doors (UDO Sec. 5.15.6.I.), rear porch columns spaced farther apart than they are tall and aluminum posts (UDO Sec. 5.15.6.H.1.). Additionally, there are size issues related to the main structure and carriage house.
3. Lot Coverage: Per UDO Sec. 5.15.5.C., the maximum lot coverage permitted in the NG-HD district for a Center Hall House Type is 60% (as of January 13, 2026 UDO text amendment). Per UDO Sec. 9.3.D.2., lot coverage is the "portion of the lot covered by any structure or constructed element that impedes infiltration of stormwater into the ground or disrupts vegetated surfaces. For purposes of lot coverage standards, structures or constructed elements that allow some infiltration, such as decks, patios and driveways, porous pavers or concrete, or other elements that disturb ground cover shall be counted towards the total surface coverage unless they demonstrate they are a functional and integral part of a stormwater system and best management practice in Article 5, Design Standards." The driveway is shown as "permeable" on the survey but may be impermeable unless the stormwater requirements can be met. For assistance, contact Christina Hurd (Town Stormwater Coordinator) at churd@townofbluffton.com.
4. Center Hall House Noncompliance: The footprint is shown as 2,059 SF. A Center Hall cannot exceed 2,000 SF (UDO Sec. 5.15.8.M.). The house is 65'-8" wide. A Center Hall is "typically 40'-55' wide" (UDO Sec. 5.15.8.M.). Further, the main structure is 3,039 SF of conditioned space. As the UDO does not distinguish between conditioned and non-conditioned, show the total square footage. Correct the Building Data on the application project analysis sheet (e.g., for the main structure, a total square footage of 5,786 is shown, which is the total project square footage under roof).
5. Carriage House: The Carriage House has a first-floor square footage of 885 square feet and an overall square footage of 1,434 square feet. UDO Sec. 5.15.8.F. allows a maximum square footage of 1,200 and maximum footprint of 800 SF. It does not appear entirely incidental to the main structure as required by UDO Sec. 5.15.8.F. Will discuss placement at HPRC meeting.
6. First Floor Height: The first floor height is shown as 2'-8". Residential structures shall have a first finished floor height raised a minimum of three (3) feet above average adjacent sidewalk grade (UDO Sec. 5.15.5.F.1.c.). The porch height must be at least 30" from grade to the top of stairs.
7. Dormers/Windows: The central front dormer should not extend beyond the front wall. Some windows appear to be in locations that suggest a possible lack of transparency (Front elevation: stairwell on first and second floors; Rear: space adjacent to Bedroom 2). Additionally, the faux window with shutters at the rear porch must have hardware to give the appearance of operable shutters (UDO Sec. 5.15.5.6.M.).
8. Shutters: Composite shutters required HPC approval.
9. Garage Door: What is the material? Only "painted" provided on the project analysis sheet.
10. Landscaping: Provide 8'-0" foundation planting at front elevation (UDO Sec. 5.3.7.E.2.).
11. Materials, Configurations and Dimensions: Label all materials on the Final Plan (in addition to the Project Analysis sheet) and ensure that they comply with UDO Sec. 5.15., as applicable. Any materials, configurations and dimensions not in compliance with the UDO must be identified in a narrative with an explanation, which will be considered by the HPC in its review of the Final Plan. Be certain that materials shown on the project analysis sheet and the plan set match to avoid confusion (e.g., analysis sheet shows vinyl windows while the typical window detail shows clad wood).
12. Given the extensive Concept Plan comments, we will discuss whether a second Concept Plan submission is necessary at that the HPRC meeting.

HPRC Review

09/11/2026

Charlotte Moore

Approved with Conditions

Comments:

1. Elevations: The elevations should be an accurate depiction of the proposed construction. The porch foundation and all of the fascias appear incomplete, including: a) Eave details need additional information including dimensioned overhangs, sizes of materials and a UDO compliant soffit material; b) the fascia board should continue from around the rake, appear to have differing detailing and must be consistent; and, d) Make sure the fascia is not run in between the rafters as drawn on the wall sections.
2. Foundation: a) How is the face of the foundation being broken up for scale? At both the entry and back porches, they are too solid; and b) If the intention is for the floor to be concrete, study the transition from the stucco walls and provide an edge detail.
3. Roof: a) Study porch headers and roof details as they appear to look different; and b) Simplify the roof over the master bedroom.
4. Fireplace and Chimney: Provide a traditional chimney cap that complies with UDO Sec. 5.15.6.E.8. "In keeping with masonry building technology, metal spark arrestors, exposed metal flues, and pre-fabricated chimney caps are permitted only when concealed within a masonry architectural feature and screened from a street"
5. Dormers: Study the dormers as they seem foreign to the design. The center dormer on the front looks too heavy; consider a shed roof dormer instead.
6. Windows: The second-floor windows should be subordinate in scale to first floor windows. The design uses casement windows on the second floor that are larger than the double hung windows below. This is further exacerbated by the casements having a larger perceived scale than the double hung windows because they are one large sash. Revise the second-floor windows to be subordinate in scale to the first floor.
7. Shutters: Use one shutter type instead of a combination (louvered and Bahama). Also, the shutter on the right elevation is foreign to the other shutters; change to a bi-fold so that it has the same proportions as the other shutters. Some windows that could have shutters do not.
8. Trees: Too many trees are being removed outside of the building footprint. This is atypical of other homes in the Stock Farm development. Additionally, off-site trees are proposed to be removed, which is not permitted.

Watershed Management Review	09/11/2026	Andrea Moreno	Approved with Conditions
-----------------------------	------------	---------------	--------------------------

Comments:

Comments may be provided at time of building permit/stormwater permit submittal.

Transportation Department Review - HD	08/19/2026	Mark Maxwell	Approved
--	------------	--------------	----------

Comments:

No comments

Plan Review Case Notes: