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HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN
The Honorable J. Palmer Gaillard, Jr.
Mayor, City of Charleston

City Council
Charleston, South Carolina 29402

Dear Mayor and Councilmen:

It is a pleasure to submit herewith the Historic Preservation Plan for the Peninsula portion of the City of Charleston. This report and plan is the culmination of three years of research and study by the City’s consultants with the assistance of many of Charleston’s citizens and organizations.

The attached report contains both long range and short term proposals. Some of the short term proposals require adoption of new ordinances by the City; others require strengthening of present programs or vigorous enforcement of existing ordinances. The long range proposals are concerned with activities or policies that cannot be carried out overnight. Some require additional study and changes in State laws. We believe, however, they are worthy objectives and should be pursued.

In all, we believe that this document sets forth action programs and long range goals which are designed to protect Charleston Historic and Architectural Heritage. We recommend that it be widely distributed so that the citizens of Charleston may understand and contribute to this program.

The Planning and Zoning Commission wishes to express its appreciation to the many organizations, City officials and individuals who have contributed freely their time and effort to this program. We look forward to their continued cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Hollings, Chairman
Planning and Zoning Commission
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

* Give official recognition to the Historic Architecture Inventory by adoption of an ordinance which requires that any addition, alteration, demolition or moving of any property on the Inventory be reviewed and approved by the Board of Architectural Review. Provide for the addition and deletion of buildings on the Inventory by the City Council upon recommendation by the Board of Architectural Review after study and report by a nationally recognized architectural historian.

* Adopt a supplement to the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Charleston which establishes height districts containing minimum and maximum heights as described herein for the portion of the Peninsula south of the Crosstown Expressway (U.S. Route 17).

* Adopt the land use plan and preservation index described herein as guides for development proposals in the area south of the Crosstown Expressway.

* Vigorously enforce existing anti-littering and weed control ordinances and strengthen them as necessary to keep both public and private property free of weeds and litter.

* Prohibit by law billboards (signs which advertise products or services not available on the same premises with the sign) and signs mounted on the roofs of buildings south of the Crosstown Expressway.

* Request that the feasibility of an anti-neglect ordinance be investigated by the City. Such an ordinance would require maintenance of historically significant properties, whether residential or non-residential, either occupied or vacant.

* Request that the Department of Planning, Relocation and Redevelopment consult with the downtown merchants and property owners along with the Downtown Council of the Chamber of Commerce and recommend a strengthened downtown revitalization program as envisioned herein.

* Request that the Department of Planning, Relocation and Redevelopment be asked to develop and recommend a coordinated rehabilitation and code enforcement program for execution by the City.

* Request that funds be authorized for design studies aimed at the revitalization of the waterfront sections along the Cooper and the Ashley Rivers, and in the commercial corridor bounded generally by Calhoun, King and Meeting Streets and the Crosstown Expressway.

* Offer support and assistance to the State Department of Archives and History in preparing a legislative package designed to strengthen the tools for Historic Preservation. Seek the following as a part of this legislative package:
  Authority for local governments to appoint a preservation agency whose powers and duties would be to:
  - Recommend to the City Council the establishment of historic districts, and designation of individual properties with historic significance;
  - Review, and approve or reject, proposals for private development within such districts and to review and make recommendations with respect to such changes proposed by public entities;
  - Acquire properties with historic significance, or acquire a lesser-than-free interest in such properties (such as a facade easement) and to exercise the power of eminent domain as required in carrying out such acquisitions.
  - Administer a revolving fund for historic preservation activities established by the City Council. The purpose of the fund would be to provide low-interest preservation loans to owners of historically significant properties and purchase properties and facade easements. Replenishment of the fund would be by the repayment of loans, resale of properties, gifts and bequests and the local budget.
  - Recommend (and the local government should have the authority to grant) the rebatement of real property taxes in whole or in part, for specified periods, as an incentive to remodel or restore historically significant properties.

* To ensure coordination of historic preservation with the City’s overall planning and redevelopment program, specifically authorize staff support for the Board of Architectural Review by the Department of Planning, Relocation and Redevelopment.
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INTRODUCTION

The people of Charleston have always been proud of their historic architectural heritage and while many other cities can justifiably claim pride in their historic architecture, none can boast of more or finer examples than are found in historic Charleston.

In 1971, the City of Charleston entered into an agreement with the Department of Archives and History of the State of South Carolina to conduct a definitive inventory of historic architecture on the peninsula south of the Crosstown Expressway, U.S. Highway 17. The purpose of the inventory was to identify the buildings which make up Charleston's architectural and historic heritage, so that a plan could be prepared to preserve them. Such a plan is proposed herein. The plan is not a single map or blueprint. It is the sum of proposed actions and programs designed to perpetuate Charleston's historic and architectural heritage as an irreplaceable part of its living fabric.

This report describes the proposed actions, programs, and the background studies leading up to them. It begins with a description of the Historic Architecture Inventory. This is followed by a chapter on the appearance of old Charleston, giving the visual problems. A land use plan is proposed as a framework within which development and preservation activities should take place. Next, a preservation index is described which establishes the preservation value of each property—that is, it tells which properties should be preserved, developed, or redeveloped in furtherance of preservation objectives. Finally, an implementation program is outlined describing proposals for state legislation, city ordinances, institutional arrangements, and other programs and studies. The report concludes with reports on citizen participation, and descriptions of special investigations of the Exchange Building.

The plan and this report were sponsored by the City of Charleston, with financial assistance by the U.S. Department of the Interior, administered by the South Carolina Department of Archives and History. Advice was provided by a wide variety and great number of individuals and organizations, private and public, who have worked toward preserving the City's historic and architectural heritage.
The great triangular portion of the City south of the Crosstown Expressway...
HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE INVENTORY

The importance of definitively recording the great architecture of historic Charleston cannot be overstated. Of all the surviving evidence of our historic culture, perhaps none demonstrates more clearly the life-style and cultural attainments of our forebears than the patterns of the great cities they built and the architecture they left for us. Charleston has continued to live and work in a remarkable number of fine buildings, therefore preserving them in large part against the degradations of time. Yet, the modern city is cruel to our architectural heritage, and there have been many severe losses—losses which were inadvisable and unnecessary. While much of Charleston's architectural heritage is well maintained and cared for with devotion, too much of it is in deteriorating or deteriorated condition. Substantial areas are in jeopardy through encroachment by incompatible land uses, by highway construction and by other proposed large scale "improvements." The values which the inventory places upon Charleston's historic architecture are not dollar values, but architectural values. These values may have monetary value as well, but money is not the equivalent of historic and cultural values, nor can dollars replace a great building destroyed.

Charleston cannot afford to lose more of its great heritage, nor can the State of South Carolina and the Nation. In order to protect this architectural heritage, it is necessary first to identify and evaluate it. From this evaluation must come plans for the protection and enhancement of these architectural riches.

The area covered by the inventory is shown on the following map entitled "The Study Area." This is the great triangular area of the City south of the Crosstown Expressway between the Ashley and the Cooper Rivers. It contains the heart of the City of Charleston—its central business district, the College of Charleston, the Medical University of South Carolina, major portions of the harbor and a substantial portion of the population of the City. The study area contains an unique treasure of historic architecture dating from early American colonial times, and it is the locus of many great historic events, significant not only in the history of Charleston and the State of South Carolina, but in that of the Nation as well.

INVENTORY METHOD

While general uniformity of survey forms throughout the United States is essential for various public purposes (such as the National Register of Historic Places), the techniques used for field investigation and recording in a particular city must be designed to reveal the special characteristics which make that city unique. In the case of Charleston, the consultants first reviewed the survey forms that had been used in the This is Charleston (1) survey and in later studies. The survey form finally selected was developed from experience with other cities.

The rating of buildings in any city-wide architectural survey is particularly important. Architectural historians often try to avoid rating buildings where it is not absolutely essential. There is excellent reason for this. Comparing buildings of any type and of any combination can only have its basis in subjective judgments. There are neither mathematical, historic, nor other criteria which can be scientifically applied. The subject matter is architecture as a fine art and a craft— a historical record of design and a sequence of cultures.

Regardless of the difficulty of evaluation, it is obvious that there are greater and there are lesser buildings. Some buildings are priceless and must be preserved at all costs. Others, though they should be retained whenever possible, could be expended in the face of overwhelming public necessity. As modern society demands space for buildings, automobiles, and for land uses different from earlier societies, the conflict between the old and the new requires constant decision-making on cultural matters. A substantial part of this decision making relates to the economic base of the community. Sometimes the cash value of structures must be weighed against the imponderable values of cultural heritage. With these things in mind, the criteria which were developed for building ratings were especially designed for Charleston.

THE STUDY AREA
The criteria were applied by a select jury after reviewing the field observations which had been recorded on survey cards. The criteria apply to all building types and periods.

Properties considered to possess architectural or visual significance were rated and placed into one of the following four categories:

**Group 1: Exceptional**
Buildings of the highest architectural design quality. Well proportioned, with a sophisticated use of architectural features, such as doors, windows, classical orders (or other period designs), chimneys, verandas, massesing, materials, textures, refined detail and craftsmanship. They are elegant and innovative, and must be preserved and protected in situ at all costs.

**Group 2: Excellent**
High style regional architecture -- fine "Charleston Style" -- well designed and proportioned, with good detail. These are spirited, dignified, frequently innovative, rare, and always attractive and interesting. Of irreplaceable importance, to be preserved in situ at all costs.

**Group 3: Significant**
Good architectural quality of the vernacular mode. Less sophisticated and refined than "Excellent." Appealing, curious and interesting. To be retained and protected.

**Group 4: Contributory**
Buildings of architectural value without which the character of those buildings rated in Groups 1 - 3 would be lessened. To be preserved and retained.

In addition to the ratings above, the inventory contains two other notations:

A. Properties which should be the subject of further research, including interiors -- the rating may warrant upgrading as a result.

B. Buildings whose fabrics have undergone adverse changes and should be restored.

The field survey was begun by driving every street, alley and public way in the Study Area, for an initial overview. Every building, structure or site which appeared to be of architectural, visual or historic significance was recorded on maps. Where significant concentrations of historic structures occurred, that area was resurveyed on foot to provide more detailed coverage. In this way, Ansonborough, Harleston Village, the Battery, Radcliffeborough, Kazyck-Maggborough and the College of Charleston areas were resurveyed, as was the two-block commercial strip centered on King Street (St. Phillips to Meeting Street) from Route 17 to Broad. Broad Street from King to East Bay, Church and Tradd Streets, and complexes of buildings between Line and Calhoun Streets on the east and west sides of the Peninsula were also resurveyed.

After completing the initial field survey, forms were prepared for each building or site recorded on the Assessor's maps, and plotted on maps of the Study Area. The maps were then checked in the field to insure comprehensive coverage. Photographs were prepared and affixed to the partially completed forms. All available published material dealing with the architecture, gardens, interiors and history of these properties was researched. Pertinent information was collected and added to the back of the forms. In this way, approximately 2,500 forms were prepared.

It was believed that a complete evaluation of the quality of many Charleston buildings could only be made when both interiors and exteriors were judged as a total architectural design expression. While the preliminary architectural survey was in progress, a parallel survey of interiors was being completed, primarily by volunteers from The Historic Charleston Foundation, the Junior League and the Harleston Village Association. The purpose of the interior inventory was to study the architectural elements only. Furnishings and other material which could not be considered an integral part of the building itself were disregarded. It was known that many buildings contained fine rooms with beautiful wood and plasterwork and other interior embellishments, even though the exteriors were relatively plain and modest.

Interiors of approximately 85 percent of all structures listed in the preliminary architectural survey in the area north
of Calhoun Street to U. S. Route 17 were surveyed. The results were added to the cards. The Harleston Village Association, through great devotion and diligence, was able to survey the interiors of almost all the buildings in their study area. In addition, the Association contributed much valuable architectural and historic data. Most of the commercial structures on King and Meeting Streets were noted through personal visits and interviews with people long associated with the architecture of Charleston. It is estimated that the interiors of 1,600 of the 2,500 buildings and sites were visited and surveyed. The remaining 800-900 were either impossible to gain entry to or, in the Battery area, omitted because of the lack of time and the fairly complete coverage of the area through previously published works.

Two experts were retained for the final review and evaluation: Dr. William Hurst of Alexandria, Virginia, Keeper of the National Register, and one of this country’s foremost authorities on architectural history and design; and Professor Bernard Lerman, Tulane University School of Architecture, Dr. Charles Lee, Director of the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, attended a substantial part of the review. Messrs. Carl Feiss and Russell Wright, historic preservation consultants, also participated. The jury visited buildings in the field whenever there were any questions regarding the evaluations.

Upon completion of the jury process, a preliminary list of rated buildings by street address was prepared. The field maps were colored to indicate buildings which were recorded in the survey. These maps and lists were then reviewed in the field for the third time, and corrected. Reproducible maps illustrating the architectural rating on every structure, site or street facade in the Study Area were then prepared.

The consultants then submitted copies of the maps to the City’s staff, the Planning and Zoning Commission, interested citizens and preservation groups for their review and comments. The Harleston Village Association, Historic Charleston Foundation, Historic Ansonborough Neighborhood Association, Council for Urban Quality, Preservation Society of Charleston, Radcliffeborough Association, Mazyck-Neagborough Neighborhood Association, and Save Charleston Foundation were among those who reviewed the inventory. The consultants conducted personal interviews with representatives of each group to discuss the changes they proposed. In several neighborhoods, these interviews were conducted while walking around the neighborhood looking at buildings with Mr. Wright. Most of the changes suggested by these groups were in the “significant” and “contributory” categories, and were made after review by Mr. Wright. In several instances, however, the recommendations were of such import that it was necessary to re-submit them to the jury. Although the jury agreed with many of the recommendations, there were instances where the opinion of the jury differed from that of local groups. In such few instances, the inventory maps remain as the jury recommended. Those who participated in the inventory believe that the published maps and list—being the product of professional judgment, checking, re-checking and local input—have the confidence and support of the major preservation groups and neighborhood associations in Charleston.

It must be stressed that while the inventory maps have been reviewed many times, additions and corrections are expected as a normal part of the inventory process. An architectural inventory, by its very nature, is never complete. As new information comes to light, buildings and sites should be added. As buildings are lost through demolition or desecration, records should be changed. To facilitate such changes, the data on the survey forms were recorded in pencil, and the photos were attached with staples rather than permanently glued to the forms. The forms are filed in loose leaf fashion. They can be rearranged, added to or removed. The inventory maps can also be corrected as needed, and new prints can be made from the master copy. Copies of the maps and list can be obtained, at nominal cost, from the City of Charleston, Department of Planning, Relocation, and Redevelopment.

The two maps in this section illustrate the inventory results. One is a sample portion of the inventory map, showing the ratings assigned to individual buildings. The ratings were also aggregated on a block-by-block basis, to give an overall picture of the distribution of historic structures and shown on the map entitled “Historic Areas.”
INVENTORY MAP
(SAMPLE)
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- GROUP 1: EXCEPTIONAL
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- GROUP 3: SIGNIFICANT
- GROUP 4: CONTRIBUTORY

BUILDINGS RATED IN CONTEXT WITH OTHERS
THE APPEARANCE OF OLD CHARLESTON

The basic form of Old Charleston is a legacy from past generations. The street patterns, many of the buildings and important vistas — even the magnificent street trees — resulted from the vision of our forefathers. They had a better eye for proportion than we do, a better sense of scale and a finer appreciation of the nuances of rhythm and detail in the architectural expressions of their culture. Or, perhaps, their culture was rooted in more lasting values, less subject to upheavals and less affected by fads. Whatever the reason, Charleston is one of the most visually appealing cities in the nation — far surpassing newer cities in harmony of scale and variety of form.

CHARLESTON’S HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE.

All the lingering romance of the ante bellum South can be found in the magnificent sweep of elegant buildings south of Broad Street to the Battery. Two-storied, columned verandas rising high over gardens, glimpsed over ancient walks and through elaborate wrought iron gates, magnolia, wisteria, camellia — all real, all lovely, all part of someone else’s past, and never to be created again anywhere. The total effect is a superb accident of assembly; buildings of fine design, superb scale, sensitive detail, great sophistication, architecturally innovative and frequently of great dignity.

The very special “Charleston Style” reaches its apogee here, although examples are frequently found elsewhere on the Peninsula. This unique residential type rises high and shallow from a half-story base, faced by two- or three-story tiers of galleries supported by slender white classical columns. The buildings rise perpendicular to the street at the sidewalk and are entered by a beautifully carved false entry which leads by a short flight of stairs to the level of the first floor gallery, half way down its length at the center, to the real entry of equally fine design. Houses in the Charleston Style vary tremendously in detail, scale, materials, richness of ornament and general design. There are never-ending surprises, attractive and unusual elements, refinements in detail, curious solutions and highly individual refinements. The whole giant south Charleston complex is a museum of the marvelous design skills and ingenuity of myriads of unknown architects, masons, carpenters, plasterers, wood carvers — all craftsmen lost to today’s world.
There are many great houses throughout Charleston that are not exactly in the Charleston Style. They may be strong versions on their own, like the Russell House (which retains the Charleston Style orientation), or Ashley Hall, or dozens of others -- great, distinguished, and unique. No interior stairways could be more beautiful than those of these two houses, or of such difference in design. While there are few duplicates among the greater houses of Charleston, there is a substantial harmony between them. This creates for Charleston its own form of that ambiguous New Orleans phrase, the *tout ensemble* -- the "all-together" which makes up the historic places, neighborhoods and districts.
Throughout the Peninsula are myriads of lesser buildings. Some of Charleston’s oldest are architecturally the simplest. The very early ones marched along Southern East Bay, Church and Tradd Streets in the center of town, and scattered elsewhere. These have an almost Dutch character — high stuccoed facades with stepped gables, tile roofs and pastel colors. They are closely arranged in rows. Individually of little design pretense, they form a picturesque and delightful streetscape of great importance.

The lesser domestic architecture of Charleston is frequently found associated with the greater. There was no economic segregation in Old Charleston. Small and large houses — simple and elaborate — are situated next door and across the street from each other. This adds immeasurably to the City’s interest and charm. The lesser domestic architecture itself is frequently fine in design, has excellent detail and, even in its simplest form, adds materially to the character of its area. Whether in visual association with a great building or with its peers, it forms an essential part of the scene.

The ecclesiastical architecture alone would have given the City an exceptional reputation.

The non-domestic buildings of Charleston comprise a substantial part of the great architecture associated with the City. The ecclesiastical architecture alone would have given the City an exceptional reputation for historic buildings of top quality. St. Michael’s and St. Philip’s Churches, the best known, are part...
of a great cast of ecclesiastical buildings, small and large, dating from the earliest settlement of the city through all historic styles. These include some of the finest Victorian Gothic buildings to be found anywhere. The interiors of the churches of all denominations and all periods are particularly rich. A full appreciation of these structures can only be gained by viewing the interiors as well as the exteriors.

Charleston’s heritage of other nonresidential structures is extraordinary. It consists of a wide variety of buildings by type and use. It is impossible to compare the architectural quality of buildings of such diversity as Manigault’s City Hall, the Exchange, the Fireproof Building by Robert Mills, the great Custom House, the Old Citadel, the fine commercial buildings on Broad and King Streets, the rice mills, the Dock Street Theatre, and all the rest. This diversity of structures is important in itself. A vital part of the total city scene -- and not to be rudely tampered with -- is the skyline, which is punctuated with the beautiful steeples of historic churches. They contribute immeasurably to the general harmony of buildings heights, which is only occasionally spoiled by modern intrusions. The street scene itself is a major element in the quality of Old Charleston. The Exchange, at the intersection of Broad and East Bay Streets, and other key buildings in key locations are major enhancements to the total urban design.
Most of Old Charleston's architectural treasures are grouped in cohesive neighborhoods - Ansonborough, The Battery, Harleston Village, Mazyck-Rossborough, Radcliffeborough - each has a distinct character of its own, even though there are many similarities of building types. These cohesive neighborhoods are one of Charleston's greatest strengths. In each, there are individuals and organizations which jealously guard the neighborhood against intrusion and degradation. Charleston's historic architecture cannot be viewed as a fortuitous collection of individual buildings. Each is an integral part of the totality.

**Major Open Spaces**

White Point Gardens, on the southern tip of the Charleston peninsula, is the site of historic events and relics. Ancient cannon guard the peaceful beauty of this restful oasis. Monuments to long-dead heroes and the memory of famed pirates add to the mystique. Broad footpaths wind through the park, flanked by benches and shaded by massive, moss-draped trees. Nearby, horse-drawn carriages begin their leisurely journey into the past. The views of open water and the beauty of the gardens make the Battery a major tourist attraction and an outstanding visual asset.

To the north, Marion Square takes up a full city block at the intersection of two of the most heavily traveled streets in the city. More open than White Point Gardens, the Square offers a variety of visual experiences. Because of the intensive development of surrounding properties, Marion Square provides a welcome relief from the congestion of the city.

The fountains in Colonial Lake accentuate its delightful appearance.

The fountains in Colonial Lake accentuate its delightful appearance. Colonial Lake is landscaped in a more open style than White Point Gardens or Marion Square. It too is bordered by busy streets, dramatizing by contrast the restful nature of the lake and surrounding promenade. It provides a softening effect on the appearance of the Sargent Jasper Apartment building which looms starkly on the horizon nearby. This 14-story building is a harsh and unfortunate contrast to its environs, and blocks the view of the Ashley River.
Prospects and Vistas.

Some of the most fascinating features of Old Charleston are the views down narrow streets. Never ending surprises delight the eye. The turn of a corner reveals an unexpected vista where the rhythm of the buildings leads the eye to the water, then to a ship in the distance. Especially on the Battery one is rarely more than a few steps from a view of the water. Murray Boulevard and East Battery offer sweeping panoramas. Murray Boulevard itself is a refreshing drive. The planting in the median strip softens what would otherwise be a harsh expanse of pavement. The broad sidewalk on the seaward side provides excellent vantage points for viewing the bay. Virtually every class of power-driven and sailing vessel can be seen from these vantage points. The lure of open water brings countless tourists to the Battery, further enriching the visual experience.

Church spires punctuate other vistas. St. Philip's, St. Matthew's and St. Michael's are the most prominently placed. The soaring height of these and other churches form major landmarks, providing a visual reference point for motorist and pedestrian alike.

Street Trees.

Street trees serve several purposes. First and foremost, they are pleasing to the eye. In addition, they provide shade, absorb street noises and fumes and conceal overhead electrical wires. The appearance of Broad, Ashley and Rutledge Streets would be vastly different without the trees which line these major arteries. Block after block of the minor streets in the Old City, especially in residential areas, are bordered by closely spaced trees. In many blocks, they form an overhead canopy. Their value to the appearance of Old Charleston cannot be overstressed.
The recent rehabilitation of the Broad Street business district points up the potentials inherent in other commercial streets. King Street is a case in point. High-walled and tightly defined, this is a visually and emotionally stimulating corridor of mercantile activity. All is not well, however, for many of the older buildings on King Street have been inadequately maintained over the years. Peeling paint, rotted trim and cracked masonry walls are jarring to the eye. The day when a King Street address was enough to assure a successful business venture is gone. "Close of business" sales in downtown stores indicate that competition from outlying shopping centers must be reckoned with. Meeting Street's famous "cast iron" district is in an even sadder state of disrepair. A few of these buildings were demolished during the course of this study. Others stand vacant, fully depreciated, and ready for the wrecking crew.

Close of Business Sales in downtown indicate that competition from outlying shopping centers must be reckoned with.

Other places and problems.

The administrators of the College of Charleston have shown a sensitive concern for the historic neighborhood of which they are a part. Many old and deteriorating houses have been restored to their original splendor for use as college housing and office space. From the College's expansion program is evolving a good example of the integration of an educational facility with its environment.

George Street is a tree-covered lifeline connecting the College with the King Street business center. To the east of the business district, George Street leads to the College Gymnasium and to the Municipal Auditorium, which offers many college-related programs. Students throng George Street throughout the day. Its pedestrian use suggests a strong potential for student-oriented shops, boutiques and restaurants.

In many blocks, trees form an overhead canopy; their value to the appearance of Old Charleston cannot be overestimated.
The Crosstown Expressway cuts a swath across the Peninsula. Traffic which formerly was diffused over residential streets is now channelled along a defined corridor. Considering the restraints of pre-existing conditions, the Expressway serves its purpose well. However, the elevated portion of the Expressway has an unfortunate environmental and visual impact on the adjoining residential area. It carries traffic just a few feet away from the second story level of homes. Land acquisition for the Expressway was too limited. In at least one instance, a house is squeezed by the eastbound and westbound traffic lanes.

Environmental problems along the Cooper River waterfront are severe. Derelict piers, rotted pilings and weedgrown fill mar the appearance of an otherwise beautiful river. Industrial properties along Concord and East Bay Streets are grimy and unkempt. Weeds, litter and junk, especially along Concord Street make this one of the most uninviting sections of the City. Bits of rusted wire and machinery parts, stockpiled crosties, even castoff automobile tires lie beside the street and on private property.

Rotting pilings and weedgrown fill mar the appearance of an otherwise beautiful river.

Most of the offstreet parking areas along the Cooper River are unpaved and unmarked.
Most of the offstreet parking areas here are unpaved and unmarked. Cars are parked haphazardly, resulting in an inefficient use of the space and a disorganized appearance. Even the few attempts to improve appearances come off poorly. The State Ports Authority's parking lot across from their new administrative headquarters building is paved and marked off into parking stalls. A few trees were planted and small shrubs mark the perimeter— all in all, a commendable attempt to enhance the appearance of the area. The overall effect is marred, however, by the chain-link security fence which surrounds the property. This is in stark contrast with the tasteful treatment of the parking lot on Gillion Street adjacent to the Exchange.

Even the surface of Concord Street is unsightly. Potholes, railroad tracks and broken pavement edges mar its appearance and give motorists a rough ride.

Within the Study Area, the only public access to the Cooper River waterfront is a small park at the foot of Adger's Wharf, in spite of the fact that there are significant tracts of vacant waterfront land. A unique natural resource such as the Cooper River should not be regarded as a marketable commodity. Its enjoyment should be guaranteed to the citizens of Charleston.

Environmental problems also exist on the other side of the Peninsula. The complex of hospitals, medical university, private medical offices and other medically-related activities has an effect on a wide area. The supply of offstreet parking space is utterly inadequate, and the spillover of automobiles into Harleston Village and Radcliffeborough is a major problem. The streets and vacant lots in the vicinity of Barke, Bennett, Halsey, Vanderhorst, and Morris Streets are overwhelmed with parked cars. This reduces the traffic-carrying capacity of the streets and is thoroughly disruptive of the historic residential character of these areas.

Maintaining the old houses in Charleston can be quite expensive. Some of them are so large that a coat of paint is a major expense. Yet paint and other preventive maintenance is necessary to protect the structural components of the building. Too many of Charleston's fine old houses have been denied this protection. Except for the area south of Broad Street, evidence of blight can be found in virtually every quarter of the Study Area. In the northern portion of the Study Area there are buildings which, were it not for their historic and architectural value, should be torn down and replaced. The building conditions map on the following page shows conditions on a block-by-block basis.
LEGEND

- Blocks in which 25% or fewer buildings are deteriorated
- Blocks in which 25%–50% of the buildings are deteriorated
- Blocks in which 50.1%–75% of the buildings are deteriorated
- Blocks in which 75% or more of the buildings are deteriorated

BUILDING CONDITIONS
Heavy tree foliage conceals overhead wires in many residential areas. Along commercial streets, however, overhead wires are very prominent. Because of wider sidewalk requirements, trees are limited along commercial streets such as Meeting, King, Spring, Cannon and Calhoun Streets.

Advertising signs scream for attention in several commercial areas, particularly along North King Street. Garish and oversized, these signs compete with each other to such an extent that their message is lost. The result is a chaotic jumble: an eyesore which serves little useful purpose.

Charleston has many dirty streets. Nothing detracts more from the image of a city than litter. Vacant lots in several residential areas are overrun with weeds, and some have become dumping grounds for rubbish and debris. Such lots are potential health hazards by serving as rat harborage and concealing objects which could harm children in their play. Their unsightly appearance has a blighting influence on nearby properties.

Throughout the business district, and in many residential areas as well, sagging curbs and broken sidewalks are a safety hazard and an eyesore.

When a lot becomes vacant in the commercial areas of the city, it is soon put to temporary or permanent use as a parking lot. Although there are examples of well-designed, paved and landscaped parking lots, too many are unpaved and rutted. Without pavement markings, cars are parked in a disorganized, haphazard manner. The result is confusion and inefficient use of the lot.

Throughout the Peninsula, there are examples of newer buildings which are completely out of character with their historic surroundings. Glaring examples of incompatible architecture can be found in the Mazyck-Hargrborough Neighborhood, where cinder block buildings are set in the midst of architecturally valuable buildings.
THE LAMPPOSTS, TRAFFIC SIGNALS, BENCHES, FIRE HYDRANTS, TRASH RECEPTACLES AND OTHER STREET "FURNITURE" MAKE UP AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE STREET SCENE. ALTHOUGH SOME OF THESE ITEMS WERE UNKNOWN IN CHARLESTON'S PAST, THEY ARE ESSENTIAL TO PRESENT DAY SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE. A GLARING EXAMPLE OF INCOMPATIBLE STREET FURNISHINGS IS ON BROAD STREET, WHERE STREET LIGHTS AND TRAFFIC SIGNALS JUT FROM GLEAMING ALUMINUM POLES IN SHARP CONTRAST TO THE SUPERB OLD COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS, SO RECENTLY RESTORED.
LAND USE PLAN

Charleston's historic architecture must not be sacrificed in the name of "progress." Indeed, the destruction of the buildings which contribute so much to the quality of life in Charleston would be the antithesis of progress. Nevertheless, urban development is intensifying on the Peninsula and throughout the Charleston area. This intensification will make certain changes necessary, in transportation routes and modes, and in land use types and locations. Without proper accommodation for future growth, traffic congestion and blight will erode the urban quality of life just as surely as would the loss of historic buildings. A carefully laid plan must be prepared so that the best of Charleston's historic buildings can be preserved while the demands of future growth are met.

The land use plan is generally considered to be the pre-eminent element of a city's comprehensive development plan. The intent of the land use plan is to guide land use decisions in the public interest, whether made by private developers or by governmental agencies. The Land Use Plan for the Study Area includes proposals for fifteen land use activity groups. These denote the recommended predominant use or general character of each area.

Development of the Land Use Plan

In 1975 the Berkeley-Charleston-Dorchester Regional Planning Council prepared the Preliminary Development Plan for the Peninsular Portion of the City of Charleston. The plan sets forth "... major concepts and desirable standards concerning the future development and redevelopment of the Peninsular portion of the City of Charleston."

The Land Use Plan described below is generally premised upon the basic objectives for the development of the Peninsula and the economic foundations cited in that document. It is tempered, however, by the consultants' observations and conclusions regarding questions of local (rather than regional) importance. The Land Use Plan is obviously more influenced by the historic preservation objective. These factors result in its being somewhat more detailed. Sharper boundary lines for major land use categories are drawn. The categories themselves are in some instances subdivided to deal with specific neighborhoods, problems, development potentials or proposed actions and studies not covered by the Preliminary Plan.

RESIDENTIAL

Seven residential areas are delineated on the plan map: Hampsteadborough/Mazyck-Kraggsborough (bounded generally by Meeting Street, Calhoun Street, East Bay Street, and U.S. 17); Ansonborough; the Church Street-Queen Street area; the Peninsula south of Broad Street; Harleston Village; Radcliffeborough (bounded generally by Coming Street, Calhoun Street, Ashley Avenue, and Cannon Street); and Elliottborough.

Residential areas include residence-serving uses, such as neighborhood businesses, churches, schools, parks, and other residentially-related institutions.

Generally, no major changes in the land uses of existing residential areas are proposed. However, the neighborhoods north of Calhoun Street are in danger of being lost forever as decent places to live. Strong remedial action is required. The fundamental problem is economic. These neighborhoods are populated by thousands of low-income families. Field studies conducted during the preparation of the plan indicate that these neighborhoods are overcongested and badly deteriorated. Neither existing community facilities nor the residences themselves were designed to support the demands now being placed upon them.

Accordingly, the city's land use policy should encourage a more efficient use of land in the northern residential areas. The gross population density may be maintained at approximately the present level but net density should be increased through the replacement of existing substandard dwellings by townhouses and garden apartments. This would allow the development of outdoor recreation facilities, school campuses, and streets more capable of handling the community's needs than do present facilities.

Clearly, the above policy will not appeal to some, perhaps many, residents of the area. The alternatives, however, are even less attractive when reduced to their simplest terms. The first alternative is to do nothing; that is, to have no long-term development policy for the area. All community development decisions would be made on the basis of day-to-day expediencies with little regard for the future. The result would be the continued deterioration of the neighborhood until it was no longer fit for human habitation. The second alternative is to encourage a
General decline in population north of Calhoun Street. Existing public facilities would eventually "become inadequate" because of the smaller population. This is unrealistic.

Highway Commercial. The plan includes existing highway commercial development in the extreme northwest corner of the Study Area, near the U.S. 17-Lockwood Drive interchange. The area is presently zoned for general business. Existing and proposed uses include motels, restaurants, automobile services, computer-oriented convenience goods and services establishments.

Local Business. The local business area is located in the Spring Street-Cannon Street corridor, between the Regional Commercial area and the Hospital-Educational complex.

This is a strip commercial area, having evolved in response to east-west commuter traffic over the Ashley River. Little remains of the highway service function, however. It is characterized by a mixture of residences with small personal service establishments, grocery stores and lounges. Most of these businesses are dependent upon walk-in trade from the surrounding neighborhood. Many of the buildings are in poor physical condition and of poor appearance.

There is little hope of grouping the numerous businesses in this area into a true neighborhood shopping center. Indeed, it may not be desirable. However, the neighborhood would benefit greatly in appearance and function from certain improvements as it stands. It is recommended that a rehabilitation program be carried out in the Spring Street-Cannon Street area. The program should be a cooperative effort of neighborhood businessmen, property owners, and the City. Its objective should be to revitalize the area as a place to do business and as a place to live while retaining its character and scale. The program should deal with such matters as structural rehabilitation, landscaping and street furniture, improved public services (police protection, street lighting, code enforcement and garbage collection), and the need for off-street parking. Doubtless, both the business community and the city government learned much from the rehabilitation of Broad Street which would be of value to the Spring Street-Cannon Street area.

Regional City. The Regional City area occupies the central corridor of the Peninsula between King Street and Meeting Street, from U.S. 17 to Wentworth Street.

Charleston's retail commercial core lies along King Street, running southward from Calhoun Street. Though suburban shopping centers have cut deeply into the area's traditional markets, a 1973 economic analysis of Charleston indicates potential for additional retail floor space on the Peninsula. This could be accommodated in the Regional City area. This area includes the traditional central business district. The land use policy for this area should encourage high density residences, offices, entertainment and eating establishments, and similar uses in addition to the retail function.

The development of the Regional City area should be governed by a detailed master plan so as to insure maximum compatibility of new development with the properties listed on the Historic Architecture Inventory. This, coupled with problems of railroad relocation and the need to consolidate land ownerships, suggests the need for considerable involvement of City government. Through an urban renewal-type program, with the City Council serving as a redevelopment commission, the necessary public-private coordination could be secured.

Specialty Commercial. This is a retail commercial area with a predominance of tourist-oriented businesses. It is located between King and Meeting Streets. Though no distinct northern boundary is drawn, the area presently begins in the block between Wentworth and Beaufain Streets. The southern boundary is the Broad Street office district.

The Specialty Commercial area is characterized by gift and souvenir shops, specialty wearing apparel, antique stores, art galleries, handicrafts, and similar uses. Many establishments occupy buildings listed on the Historic Architecture Inventory, adding to the charm of the area.

Office-Financial. This is Charleston's traditional center of financial, legal, and related professional services along Broad Street between the "Four Corners of Lam" and the Exchange Building.
Office-financial uses should be extended into the East Bay Street-Concord Street corridor, from Boyce’s Wharf northward to the Market Street commercial area. The area would be anchored on the south by the Exchange Building and on the north by the Custom House. New development should focus on Pridgeon Street: because of its view of the Cooper River and relationship to the Broad Street area, Pridgeon Street has outstanding potential for the development of new commercial offices and supporting uses including parking garages.

The development of this area is hindered because the Port Authority owns the two key parcels of land on Concord Street between Vendue Range and Mid Atlantic Wharf. These are being used as parking lots, sorely needed here but hopelessly inadequate. It is recommended that the City seek the release of this land for private development in combination with a multi-level parking facility.

Office-Institutional. The office-institutional area is located on Calhoun Street between Ashley Avenue and St. Philip Street opposite the College of Charleston. It closely follows the existing limited business zoning district. The latter has permitted the area to begin a transition from residential to non-residential uses. Over half of the Calhoun Street frontage in this section is now developed for non-residential purposes, much of it for office-institutional uses as proposed in this plan.

Market Street Commercial. The Market Street commercial area adjoins the southern edge of Ansonborough between Meeting Street and East Bay Street. It lies between the tourist-oriented King Street-Meeting Street area and the Broad Street-East Bay Street office area. As a result of its great age and its location between two major land use blocks, the area is occupied by a variety of commercial uses - wholesale, retail, and services, including a number of fine restaurants.

The Market Street area should continue in a pattern of mixed commercial uses for the foreseeable future. Several buildings of historic and architectural importance here are gaining the attention of the preservation movement. There has been some effort to restore them for commercial uses (including the Market sheds). Should such restoration efforts be successful, the remainder of the area would doubtless become attractive to additional investment. It may then become possible to develop a residential link between Ansonborough and the Queen Street-Church Street neighborhood, as proposed in the 1965 land use plan. The block bounded by Church Street, State Street, South Market Street and Linguard Street is the critical element of such a link. In any event, the Zoning Ordinance should permit residential development in the Market Street area in addition to the predominant commercial uses.

Industrial, Ports. These uses are located along the Cooper River waterfront in essentially their present positions. With the possible exception of the northern end of the King Street-Meeting Street corridor, this is the only part of the Study Area suitable for major industrial uses, and only marginally so, at that, because of its small size. The City should persuade the Port Authority to confine its operations in the Study Area to the east side of East Bay Street (north of Calhoun Street), and to the east side of Concord Street (south of Calhoun Street).

Neighborhood Centers. Open space and recreational facilities are in desperately short supply throughout the northern half of the Study Area. Two neighborhood centers are proposed to partially alleviate this shortage.

In the northeast quadrant of the Study Area, the neighborhood center consists of Hampstead Square, Columbus Street Elementary School, and Charles A. Brown High School. The schools themselves provide recreational opportunities during and after school hours. The value of Hampstead Square as an open space resource is greatly diminished because it is segmented by Columbus and America Streets. The square should be restored in part by closing sections of these streets, re-routing traffic and recovering the abandoned rights-of-way for open space use. A second objective of this would be the elimination of heavy traffic originating in the area of the ports. The private properties remaining on the block with the high school should be acquired, cleared, and added to the school site.

The second neighborhood center is the site of the non-closed Simonton Elementary School. The City should acquire this
property from the County School Board immediately and redevelop the site for intensive recreational uses. As funds and relocation housing resources permit, the center should be expanded to the east and south.

**Waterfront Open Space.** Existing waterfront open spaces consist of White Point Gardens, the City marina, and the City playground on East Bay Street. The latter two should be expanded to include the marshland south of the marina and the filled land north of the playground (at the foot of Exchange Street).

It should be a City policy to monitor the use of institutionally-owned waterfront properties south of Adger’s Marsh and to consider their acquisition for park usage as they come onto the real estate market.

**Coast Guard Station.** The plan includes the U.S. Coast Guard station at the western end of Broad Street. Expansion of the present site is not recommended.

The use is not appropriate in this otherwise residential area. However, as the station does not seem deleterious to nearby residences and, as it apparently satisfies Coast Guard needs, its continuation here is acceptable. Should the Coast Guard close the station in the future, the City should acquire the property, including the historic Grishom Rice Mill buildings, and use it as a public park.

**Coliseum-Convention Center.** The eastern end of Calhoun Street is designated as the site of a coliseum-convention center. The center would consist of the existing municipal auditorium, a new coliseum, restaurants, hotels (including a "boatel"), a waterfront park, and housing. The proposal also entails the redevelopment of the aged and unattractive Marsh Street public housing project.

The possibility of building a coliseum has been discussed in Charleston for several years. The eastern end of Calhoun Street has been recommended as the first-choice site largely because of its proximity to the auditorium. This would allow joint use of parking facilities, maintenance forces, and aggregation of markets for food and lodging accommodations.

As proposed, the coliseum-convention center constitutes a major redevelopment project requiring 6-8 years for completion. A combination of public and private action is needed. It is a worthwhile effort, however, in terms of social and physical rewards. It would be a means of revitalizing a badly blighted, under-utilized sector of the Peninsula.

**College-Institutional.** This area lies west of St. Philip Street, between Calhoun and Beaufain Streets. It includes the College of Charleston, Memminger School, and Bishop England School.

The area allows for expansion of existing institutional uses. Southerly expansion of the College is consistent with its long-range campus plan. City development policies should recognize the College’s interests in this and provide appropriate assistance. However, further expansion into the residential area west of Coming Street should not be permitted.

**Hospital-Educational.** The Hospital-Educational area encompasses the Medical University of South Carolina, Cooper Hospital-Veterans’ Hospital, St. Francis Hospital, and related medical offices south of Calhoun Street.

The medical complex on Calhoun Street, especially the Medical University, needs Lebensbaum. The health care facilities located here are extremely important to the citizens of Charleston and a wide region beyond. Large tracts of land must be assembled to house the massive structures required by modern medical science. The basic land requirement is multiplied by the need for off-street parking facilities.

The plan allows for considerable expansion of these uses north of Bee Street and limited expansion east of Ashley Avenue. The South Carolina Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education has been considering the area north of Bee Street as a possible site for a two-year college to replace Palmer College. The Medical University has recently revised its campus master plan to include acquisition of the block bounded by Ashley, Rutledge, Doughty, and Mill Streets (site of the High School of Charleston). Such ancillary uses as low-cost housing for students and employees, medical offices, and a limited amount of neighborhood-serving
RETAIL COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT SHOULD ALSO BE PERMITTED WITHIN THE AREA.

THE BUILDING SCALE IN HARLESTON VILLAGE AND RADCLIFFE-
Borough is much smaller and more intimate than that required for medical-related uses. High-rise buildings, large parking lots, and accompanying traffic are unacceptable in these neighborhoods. Thus, Hospital-Educational uses, including supporting parking facilities, should not be permitted to expand south of Calhoun Street, nor east of the boundary shown on the plan map.

Circulation: The Traffic Volume Map shows the average daily traffic volumes on major Study Area streets for 1969, the most recent year for which this information is available. As might be expected, the map indicates high traffic volumes along Calhoun Street, East Bay Street, Meeting Street, Lockwood Drive, and Broad Street. Others, such as St. Philip Street and Concord Street appear to have unused capacity. Capacity can be increased on these and other streets by the removal of parking.

The Land Use Plan includes proposals for several changes in the street system of the Study Area:

Concord Street: Concord Street should be upgraded to major arterial status. North of Charlotte Street it could be elevated to permit more efficient use of port authority property at the Columbus Street terminal. This would offer additional views of the Cooper River which have been blocked by the marf buildings owned by the port Authority. Concord Street should also be extended past South Ashley's marf and brought back into East Bay Street to permit improved movements into and out of the Battery. A re-organization of parking and playground uses will permit this improvement to be made so as to minimize affects on surrounding residential properties. Unused railroad tracks should be removed from Concord Street (and from streets in adjacent commercial and residential areas) and curbs and gutters installed.

St. Philip Street: A connection between King Street and St. Philip Street is proposed just south of U. S. 17. Southbound traffic which would normally continue down King Street could use St. Philip Street as an alternate. This would lessen congestion on King Street and reduce travel time for trips with destinations far down the peninsula. In addition, St. Philip Street should be realigned at its intersections with Beaufain Street and Queen Street to ensure a smooth flow of traffic.

Lockwood Drive-Murray Boulevard: The City and the Coast Guard are now studying a proposal to join Lockwood Drive with Murray Boulevard. This would complete a scenic route along the entire study area waterfront. If this link is built, some traffic which now takes Lockwood Drive to Broad Street might be attracted one more block south to Tradd Street. An investigation should be made of the possibility of closing Tradd Street at the Coast Guard Station, just east of the Murray Boulevard intersection, to prohibit this movement.

Bicycle routes: Bicycling as a sport and, to a lesser extent, as a means of personal transportation, is enjoying a renewed interest. Faster than walking and more flexible than automobiles, bicycles are regarded by many people as the ideal vehicle for sight-seeing. Since an increased use of bicycles would reduce traffic congestion, air pollution and fossil fuel consumption, the city should encourage this trend. Marked bicycle routes should be established throughout the city. In historic areas, consideration should be given to bicycle zones, where streets could be blocked off to cars at certain times of the day, especially on weekends.
COMPOSITE PRESERVATION INDEX

The zoning ordinance has been Charleston's principal historic preservation tool for many years. Zoning for preservation purposes has had considerable success but, like conventional zoning, it has had its failures. Given the facts of a new inventory of important architecture and the shortcomings of zoning as a preservation tool, it is essential that future preservation decisions be based upon broader considerations than has been the case to date.

The Historic Architecture Inventory is the heart of this preservation plan. The composite preservation index establishes the relative preservation value of every property in the Study Area based upon its architectural merit, physical condition, and compatibility with surrounding properties in terms of land use and scale. The index thus identifies both those properties which should be preserved and, equally important, those which can or should be developed or redeveloped in furtherance of preservation objectives.

Elsewhere in this report, detailed design and neighborhood renewal studies are recommended. They would refine the general development proposals of this study. It is essential that the preservation index be used as an underlying criterion for the development of such detailed plans. The index should also be used to guide day to day decisions on development proposals.

The index classifies property in the study area as follows:

PRESERVATION -A: These areas generally include: (1) properties in the "exceptional" and "excellent" preservation categories, regardless of structural condition; (2) properties in the "significant" preservation category which are in good structural condition (or needing minor repair), and which are also compatible in use; and (3) major open spaces. Buildings with exceptional interiors or gardens or buildings that are part of a row would elevate buildings in the next (preservation -B) category to this level. Properties in the preservation -A category must be preserved at all cost.

PRESERVATION -B: Generally, the preservation -B areas include: (1) properties in the "significant" preservation category which need major repair; (2) properties in the "contributory" preservation category and in good condition (or needing minor repair); (3) major investments of community facilities which are compatible with the neighborhood; (4) properties which contribute in a positive way to the character and environment of historic Charleston. While such properties may not be rated as examples of a particular architectural style, they are representative of early- to mid-20th century construction. Because of their use of materials, scale, siting, landscaping and visual interest (especially when they occur in groups and concentrations, like the Murray Boulevard-Gibbes Street area) such properties have been placed in this index category in recognition of their importance to the townscape; and (5) properties which are part of a row or other combination but which, because of their structural condition, would be scored in the Conditional Redevelopment index category. These were placed in the Preservation -B index category because their loss would affect the total importance of the row.

Properties in the Preservation -B index category should be preserved unless they are to be replaced by something of a much higher quality.

CONDITIONAL REDEVELOPMENT: These are properties which may have little or no architectural significance but which are in scale with the neighborhood. There is little basis to retain them on the grounds of architectural quality alone. However, if they are to be replaced, there should be rigid control over the replacement. Replacement should be permitted only after it has been demonstrated that the replacement will benefit the surrounding area. Because of increased rehabilitation activity (especially in the area above Calhoun Street) a large number of the buildings in the Conditional Redevelopment index category will probably be upgraded to the preservation -B category as the quality of the environment and structural conditions improve.

DEVELOPMENT: These are vacant lots which can be developed without jeopardizing architectural and historic preservation objectives. Such development should be in harmony with the surrounding area, however.

DEVELOPMENT/REDEVELOPMENT: These include lots and buildings which should be developed or redeveloped in order to enhance or improve the visual quality of a street frontage, remove an incompatible building, or otherwise further architectural and historic objectives.
IMPLEMENTING THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN

STATE LEGISLATION.

Although South Carolina counties have the authority to acquire and restore historic properties, and cities can appoint boards of architectural review, the State of South Carolina does not have adequate legislation to enable local governments to carry out an effective program aimed at the preservation of historically and architecturally significant buildings and districts. This leaves local programs vulnerable to serious legal challenge. As pressures for urbanization intensify, pushing property values and taxes on the Peninsula ever higher, the likelihood of a court test will become more acute. Therefore, one of the primary recommendations of this report is that a carefully drafted legislative package be presented to the State Legislature as soon as possible.

In at least ten states, legislation has given localities the authority to undertake historic preservation activities as a separate function, divorced from the zoning function. Other states have expanded their zoning enabling legislation to include historic preservation.

Whichever course is followed, State legislation should make it clear that local governments have the authority to acquire properties of historic or architectural significance or a less-than-fee interest in such properties, such as conservation easements, facade easements and preservation restrictions. The power to acquire such properties should be by gift, bequest or purchase, including the power of eminent domain. Moreover, the authority to sell the properties subject to covenants ensuring continued maintenance and restoration should be granted.

To raise funds for preservation activities, local governments should have the authority to issue bonds, levy taxes, accept gifts and bequests, and use such other monies as may become available.

As an incentive to private preservation efforts, the abatement in whole or in part of real property taxes on historically or architecturally significant structures should be within the power of local governments.

As a corollary power, the authority should be granted to allow tax credits for expenses necessary to restore and maintain significant properties. The power to adjust property taxes could go far toward relieving the pressure to replace a historic building with a more marketable structure. Tax abatement or tax credits for maintenance and restoration expenses would also remove the penalty presently exacted when these activities are undertaken.

Local governments should also have the authority to prevent "demolition by neglect" through the enactment of ordinances requiring owners to maintain the structural soundness of buildings. Should the owner refuse to do so, local governments should be empowered to cause the repairs to be made and charge the cost as a lien against the property. This authority should encompass nonresidential buildings as well as dwellings.

Since historic properties all too often are threatened by public works projects, State legislation should prevent encroachment on any historically or architecturally significant property by federal, State, county or municipally funded projects until the plans have been approved by the Department of Archives and History. Such legislation might be patterned after the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

Finally, the State of South Carolina should establish by legislation that all State-owned property is subject to local regulatory measures such as zoning and subdivision regulations. This is particularly important for Charleston, considering the large areas of land on the Peninsula which are owned by the State. Some of the State's holdings in Charleston are in areas of critical concern to historic preservation efforts. Expansion of the State's property - vertically or horizontally - should be subject to review by the community within the context of the comprehensive plan, including the Historic Preservation Plan.

LOCAL LEGISLATION.

Charleston's historic preservation associations need help. In the past, these private, nonprofit organizations have taken
On tasks which seemed impossible and, in many cases, achieved miraculous results. Since they must rely mostly on private contributions and since they have no legislative authority, it is increasingly difficult for them to compete in the market place. The Save Charleston Foundation cannot hope (nor should they be expected to) raise $1.2 million very often as they did in 1973, to purchase the venerable old warehouses in the vicinity of historic Lodge Alley.

The City of Charleston has limited its preservation activities to adopting the "Old and Historic Districts" and the "Old City District" as a part of its Zoning Ordinance, and establishing the Board of Architectural Review. Although the preservation movement would have been sorely hampered without this help from the city, it is no longer enough. The City and County of Charleston must take much stronger roles in historic preservation, including new legislation, leadership and financial commitment.

The Board of Architectural Review. For more than forty years, the Charleston Zoning Ordinance has been a remarkably effective preservation device. Without the Board of Architectural Review and the powers vested in it by law, many fine buildings would have been lost. However, pressure for more intensive development on the Peninsula is mounting. If Charleston’s heritage is to be saved, the Board’s powers must be strengthened.

One of the most significant findings of the Historic Architecture Inventory is that a great many buildings which should be preserved are outside the Old and Historic District. Furthermore, some of them are less than one hundred years old, and therefore, do not have the protection of the Board of Architectural Review. Such being the case, it is recommended that all buildings and landmarks in Groups 1 through 4 on the Inventory be placed under the aegis of the Board of Architectural Review. The Board should have the authority to prevent the alteration, addition to, demolition or moving of such buildings until it has issued a Certificate of Appropriateness. In addition, a Certificate should be required for all new construction on the Peninsula, south of the Crosstown Expressway, U.S. Highway 17.

Such a measure would have two distinct advantages over the current provisions in the Zoning Ordinance: (1) it would eliminate the uncertainties in the "over one hundred years old" provision, and (2) it would enable the Board to protect the environment of isolated historic buildings. Although enacted only recently, the provision giving the Board certain review authority in the case of buildings over one hundred years old has already caused difficulties. The exact age of old buildings is sometimes very difficult or impossible to determine.

It might seem logical to afford differing degrees of protection to the buildings on the Historic Architecture Inventory, in accordance with their ranking in groups. The danger in this is that the preservation of buildings in the lower-ranked groups might become unnecessarily difficult. The threat to their continued existence could increase as their rank diminished. Thus, the City could be deprived of all evidence of where and how its ordinary men and women lived, leaving a distorted picture of an upper-class environment.

If the Inventory is cast in the form of an ordinance, a method must be devised for adding buildings to the Inventory, and removing them. Indeed, this should be done in any event. Consequently, it is recommended that the Board of Architectural Review be empowered to recommend changes in the Inventory, on its own motion or on petition by any citizen. Funds should be made available so the Board could obtain the opinion of professionals in historic preservation. Public hearings should be held, and the City Council should make the final decisions.

To insure coordination of public works with preservation efforts, the Board of Architectural Review should be given the authority to review and recommend modifications of all plans for streets, sidewalks, planting, lighting, signs and other street "furnishings" as to their dimensions, type, textures, colors, location and other physical features.

The citizens of Charleston represent a vast storehouse of knowledge about the minutest details of many old buildings.

on the Peninsula. In order for the Board of Architectural Review to have the full advantage of this information, it is essential that all Board meetings be well-publicized and open to the public. As a further aid to the free flow of information, it is recommended that no certificate of Appropriateness be issued until the Board has sought comments from the neighborhood association whose area of interest includes the property in question. A precise definition of a "bonafide neighborhood association" would be necessary. Although a private association’s views should not be binding on the Board, they might shed new light on a particular issue.

At the present, the Zoning Ordinance requires that five of the seven members of the Board of Architectural Review be drawn from specific organizations. This provision should be broadened to include all facets of the community. Nominees should be from preservation and environmental groups, architectural and engineering professions and real estate and merchant groups. In the interest of maintaining a close liaison, it also is recommended that a member of the City Council and a member of the Planning and Zoning Commission be appointed to the Board of Architectural Review, but that no further restrictions be placed on the make-up of the Board.

A close working relationship between the Board of Architectural Review and the Planning and Zoning Commission is particularly important. Decisions made by either of these agencies can have a profound effect upon the work of the other. To open additional channels of communication, it is recommended that the Director of Planning, Relocation and Redevelopment be designated as the administrative officer for the Board.

Section 51-25 of the Charleston Zoning Ordinance states: "Members appointed by the City Council shall consist of a member of the American Institute of Architects, a member of the Carolina Art Association, a member of the Planning and Zoning Commission, a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers and a member of the Real Estate Board."

Under current procedures, the Board of Architectural Review has no opportunity to reconsider its decisions. Once the Board has approved or rejected an application, an aggrieved citizen’s only recourse is to appeal to the courts—a lengthy and costly procedure. To allow for greater procedural flexibility, it is recommended that the Board be allowed to reconsider a decision in a manner similar to the procedure followed by the Charleston Board of Adjustment. If a petition for reconsideration is filed with the Board of Adjustment within five days after it has made a decision, the Board can set aside its decision and consider the matter again. Such a petition must state the grounds upon which it is believed that the Board has misunderstood the question involved, or has erred in its findings. The Board can reject the petition to reconsider, and let its original decision stand.

Sometimes, a developer wishes to replace a historic building with a new structure of great architectural merit and of a scale and proportion to blend harmoniously with its environs. Foreknowledge of the proposed redevelopment of a site would aid the Board of Architectural Review in its deliberations on an application to demolish or move a historic building. Applicants should be required to submit information about the proposed structure along with the application for a permit to demolish or move the existing one. In the case of a large project, it would be unreasonable to require exact and detailed information. Usually, long periods of time are required to find tenants, arrange financing, prepare construction drawings and build a large project. During this period, fluctuations in the economy, changes in the money market and corporate decisions beyond the control of the developer can dictate substantial changes in the design of a large project. Nevertheless, the developer should be required to submit at least a conceptual plan indicating, as a minimum, the proposed use of the building or buildings, probable range of building heights, setbacks and general location of buildings, off-street parking and other physical features. A substantial departure from the conceptual plan should require the approval of the Board of Architectural Review. Unauthorized departures should be subject to criminal penalty.
MORE EXACT INFORMATION SHOULD BE REQUIRED WHEN A SINGLE BUILDING ON A SMALL LOT IS PROPOSED. EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS, AND SAMPLES OF MATERIALS AND COLORS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED.

THE DEMOLITION OR MOVING OF A HISTORIC BUILDING SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED UNTIL A BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED FOR THE REPLACEMENT STRUCTURE. SUCH A POLICY WOULD HELP PREVENT THE PRACTICE OF REMOVING BUILDINGS, THEN LEAVING THE PROPERTIES IN A VACANT STATE FOR LONG PERIODS OF TIME BEFORE CONSTRUCTION BEGINS.

It is recommended that before the Board of Architectural Review issues a demolition permit, analysis of the architectural features of the building be completed for their information. A form similar to the one used in the official inventory could be used to evaluate the interior as well as the exterior of a building in question.

Finally, powers granted to the Board of Architectural Review must not be allowed to result in a confiscation of property without reasonable compensation to the owners. If the owner of a historically or architecturally significant building proves that he cannot realize a reasonable economic return on the money he has invested in the building, he should have the right to tear it down. If there is an overriding public interest in preserving the building, there is a concomitant public obligation to assume part or all of the cost. Purchase by the city, on recommendation by the Board of Architectural Review, is the most direct way for the public to assume the burden of preserving buildings. Since property taxes are an important part of the cost of property ownership, tax abatement is another way. Still another method is purchase of a less-than-fee interest in the property, such as a facade easement.

New York City's Landmarks Preservation Law, adopted in 1965, guarantees landmarks owners that they will not have to bear an unreasonable burden because of the public's interest in their property. Since it would place the Charleston Preservation Program on a firm legal and equitable footing, it is recommended that the method be adopted in Charleston.

In other sections of this report, it is recommended that the powers of the Board of Architectural Review be expanded to include a broader range of activities, such as the administration of a revolving fund. In view of the expanded preservation role envisioned for the Board, its present title would be inappropriate. Consequently, as the Board is re-organized to undertake the new functions, it is recommended that the Board be given a more fitting name.

CHANGES IN THE ZONING ORDINANCE. Of all the provisions in the Charleston Zoning Ordinance, none is more potentially damaging to the cause of historic preservation than the unlimited building heights permitted in nonresidential zoning districts. In all business and industrial districts, the Ordinance permits a building to rise as a distance equal to three times the setback from the centerline of the street on which it fronts. A complicated "exception" in Section 51-45.5 liberalizes the height restrictions in business zones even more, relating them to the cubic content of the building and the area of the lot upon which it is situated. Thus, the Ordinance sets no absolute height limits in some of the areas containing the most historically valuable, low-lying buildings. New construction could dwarf many of the most interesting structures on the Peninsula.

A specific protective interest in the property. This interest to be acquired may range from an easement to a fee title. Finally, if the city takes no action, the Commission must then grant the owner a notice to proceed with the originally rejected plan. In 1966, the New York Supreme Court upheld this general approach.

The New York method establishes in advance a measurable point at which the burden of the restrictions will be deemed to be too heavy for the owner to bear. It achieves a balancing of public necessity and private interest by recognizing that a property owner who is unreasonably restricted from altering or demolishing his structure must either be compensated for the burden he is asked to carry in the public interest, or be freed from the restrictive regulations.

It is recommended that a special Height District Ordinance be enacted to supplement the Charleston Zoning Ordinance. The Height Districts which should be made applicable to the Study Area are shown on the map on the following page. The purpose of each district and the regulations which should apply to each are as follows:

**Height District-50:** These districts are located along the commercial spine of the Study Area. Tall buildings in these areas will not block the view of either waterfront. There are significant tracts of land in these areas which could be assembled for large-scale development, especially in the area north of Hutson Street. More intensive development is in the Height District-50 south of Calhoun Street would strengthen the central business district by making more space available for commercial and office activities, and for high-rise residential buildings.

However, the upper stories of taller structures should set back from the street to ensure light and air at the street level, and to avoid the "canyon" effect. In addition, new structures should respect the height of historically significant buildings in the vicinity. To these ends, the following regulations are recommended in Height District-50:

A. No structure shall exceed a height of ninety feet;
B. All portions of a structure between the fifty- and seventy-foot height levels shall set back at least thirty feet from all street right-of-way lines;
C. All portions above the seventy-foot height level shall set back from all streets at least one foot for every foot of height above seventy feet in addition to the thirty-foot setback required above;
D. Notwithstanding the above, no portion of a structure which is within fifty feet of an existing building with an "Exceptional" (Group 1) or "Excellent" (Group 2) rating on the Historic Architecture Inventory shall exceed the height of such existing building.

**Height District-50/30:** This district includes the land within 100 feet of King Street from the Crosstown Expressway to Broad Street; Broad Street from King to East Bay Street; East Bay Street from Broad to within 100 feet of Market Street; and Market Street from King Street to Meeting Street. Along these streets, existing buildings form a virtually continuous wall of uniform height. This wall effect is a significant feature in the development of Old Charleston, and should be preserved. To achieve this purpose, it is recommended that the maximum building height in Height District-50/30 be established at fifty feet, and the minimum at thirty feet. No setback should be permitted.

**Height District - M:** The medical complex, which makes up most of Height District - M, has many of the characteristics of a campus. Although some of the tallest structures in the Study Area can be seen here, many of them are surrounded by generous expanses of open space. Although some of the "open space" is used for off-street parking, much of it is attractively landscaped greenward. The campus-like appearance is an asset which should be encouraged in order to temper the somewhat overpowering size of the medical facilities, and to relate them to the human scale.

To capitalize upon and strengthen the campus-like development of the medical complex, the following regulations are recommended for Height District - M:

A. No absolute limit on building heights;
B. All portions of a building below the twenty-five foot height level shall set back at least twenty-five feet from all street lines;
C. Above the twenty-five foot height level, all portions of a building shall set back from all street lines a distance equal to one foot for every foot of height above twenty-five feet. In addition to the twenty-five feet required above;
D. Notwithstanding the above, no portion of a structure which is within fifty feet of an existing building with an "Exceptional" (Group 1) or "Excellent" (Group 2) rating on the Historic Architecture Inventory shall exceed the height of such existing building.
HEIGHT DISTRICT – M: The area from 100 feet north of Market Street to the Crosstown Expressway and from 100 feet east of East Bay Street to the Cooper River is designated as Height District – M. The major objective in this area should be to prevent future construction from unduly blocking the view of the river. The primary concern is the spacing of buildings rather than the height of buildings. To avoid walling off the waterfront, buildings should not be too close to each other.

These broad objectives should be supplemented by the following requirements:

A. All future construction shall be subject to review and approval by the new historic commission;
B. No building shall be nearer to the nearest right-of-way line of the street on which it fronts than a distance equal to the height of the building;
C. The ground coverage of all buildings on a lot shall not exceed twenty-five percent of the lot area, “ground coverage” being defined as the area of the largest floor in each building;
D. No building shall be nearer to an interior property line or a side street line than a distance equal to one-half the height of the building;
E. The aggregate width of all buildings on a lot, measured along a line running parallel to the waterfront, shall not exceed fifty percent of the least dimension of the lot, measured parallel to the waterfront. Wharf buildings shall be exempted from this provision. Buildings should be spaced such that no street is blocked by a building, thereby preserving the vista from East Bay Street eastward.
F. Notwithstanding the above, no portion of a structure which is within fifty feet of an existing building with an “Exceptional” (Group I) or “Excellent” (Group II) rating on the Historic Architecture Inventory shall exceed the height of such existing building.

HEIGHT DISTRICT – 50: This, the largest single height district recommended for the study area, includes mostly residential areas. The maximum building height in this District should be fifty feet or three stories, whichever is less. This is the height limit which is currently applicable in most of Height District 50, and is compatible with most of the existing development. Within this district there should also be a minimum height of 25 feet for any principal building on a lot. Buildings constructed on waterfront property within this district should be spaced so that the view from any street extending from East Bay eastward toward the waterfront should not be blocked.

Minimum setbacks in Height District – 50 should be as stated in the Zoning Ordinance for the various zones included in this Height District, except as modified below.

HEIGHT DISTRICT – 35: Most of Height District – 35 is also residentially developed. It is recommended that the current height restriction of thirty-five feet or 2-1/2 stories be continued. Setbacks should be as stated in the Zoning Ordinance except as modified below.

Just as building heights in certain commercial districts should be related to the height of existing buildings, setback from the street should be related to the setback line observed by prior construction in residential zoning districts. In residential districts, the setback from the street for future buildings should be as presently stated in the Zoning Ordinance except when adjacent lots have been developed with less setback. In such a case, the required setback for the proposed building should be the average of the setbacks on adjoining lots. Such a provision would help to prevent a ragged street edge, which is not in character with Charleston’s older development.

It was also the practice in Charleston’s earlier development to “square off the corner” by building to the property lines at street intersections. Section 51-11 of the Zoning Ordinance prohibits construction within 15 feet of the intersection of street lines, for vision clearance. This provision should be modified to require vision clearance only along designated major streets, such as Calhoun, Lockwood Boulevard, and Meeting Street from Calhoun Street northward.

The Zoning Ordinance contains three exceptions to height limits which could effectively destroy the intent of the regulations. They are paragraphs 4, 5, and 6 of Section 51-45.

Paragraph 4 permits certain types of buildings to be built to a height of eighty feet (not exceeding six stories) in any zone district except SR-1 and SR-2 (single family detached residential districts). Although additional side yard width is required, it is nevertheless legally permissible to build an eighty-foot building in the midst of 35-foot dwellings.

Paragraph 5 pertains only to business zone districts. It permits new buildings to exceed the already too-liberal height limitations in business zones by a complicated formula.

PARAGRAPH 6, APPLICABLE IN BUSINESS OR INDUSTRIAL ZONES, REMOVES ALL HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS FROM "STRUCTURES REQUIRING SPECIAL DESIGN ON ACCOUNT OF THEIR PARTICULAR USE IN INDUSTRY OR COMMERCE." EXAMPLES GIVEN ARE CHIMNEYS, STACKS, GRAIN ELEVATORS AND DETACHED WATER OR WINDLESS TOWERS.

Paragraphs 4, 5 AND 6 OF SECTION 51-45 SHOULD BE REPEALED.

ADVERTISING SIGNS PROVIDE A USEFUL SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC. HOWEVER, A CAREFUL BALANCE MUST BE MAINTAINED BETWEEN COMMUNITY APPEARANCE AND SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC. CERTAIN TYPES OF SIGNS, PARTICULARLY ROOF SIGNS AND BILLBOARDS, ARE ESPECIALLY OBFUSCATIVE, AND THEIR PURPOSE CAN BE SERVED THROUGH OTHER ADVERTISING MEDIA.

BILLBOARDS (SIGNS WHICH ADVERTISE PRODUCTS OR SERVICES NOT AVAILABLE ON THE SAME PREMISES WITH THE SIGN) AND SIGNS MOUNTED ON THE ROOFS OF BUILDINGS SHOULD BE PROHIBITED BY LAW IN THE STUDY AREA. Indeed, serious consideration should be given to prohibiting billboards and roof-mounted signs throughout the City. An amortization period, such as three years, should be established for existing roof signs and billboards and, after the expiration of the period, removal should be required.

The term "electric signs" should be deleted from Paragraph 7, Section 51-45 of the Zoning Ordinance. This paragraph exempts such signs from height restrictions when they are erected upon a building.

As discussed elsewhere in this report, a study should be made of the proper land uses on the Ashley River waterfront and vicinity. Pending the outcome of such a study, the tract of land bounded by Barre, Canal, and Broad Streets and the Ashley River should be rezoned to SR-2 Single Family Residential. This tract is presently zoned for nonresidential purposes.

Finally, the number of residential zones should be reduced substantially. At present, there are twelve residential zoning districts in the Charleston Zoning Ordinance. This leads to an unnecessarily complex ordinance. A detailed study of existing development patterns would probably reveal no need for such a large number of districts, especially if the above recommendations regarding setback and height regulations are adopted.

ANTINEGLIGENCE ORDINANCES: Perhaps the most tragic loss of historically or architecturally significant buildings occurs through neglect, deliberate or otherwise, of the structural components. Deliberate neglect is especially vicious. By withholding critical maintenance, the property-owner can eventually prove that repairing the building is infeasible. An anti-neglect ordinance should be adopted to require the continued maintenance of the basic structural elements of buildings. Housing codes are not enough, since they apply only to occupied dwellings. The anti-neglect ordinance should be applicable to nonresidential buildings as well, whether occupied or vacant. If an owner refuses to maintain the building, the City should cause necessary repairs to be made, charging reasonable costs as a lien against the property. An alternative to this would be to exercise the powers discussed on page 45.

NEED AND LITTER CONTROL: Strong anti-littering and weed control programs are needed in Charleston. The City should especially vigilant to keep rights-of-way and other public property free of weeds and rubbish. In some areas of the City, privately-owned vacant lots have been allowed to grow up in weeds, and to become a dumping ground for trash. Ordinances have been adopted requiring property-owners to keep vacant lots clear of weeds and refuse. These should be vigorously enforced. The City should exercise its authority to clean up vacant lots when the owners refuse to do so, and to charge the cost as a lien.

TAX POLICIES: Present property tax policies not only discourage the restoration of historic properties, but usually penalize it. More often than not, restoring such properties results in a substantial increase in value. Since property taxes are levied in proportion to property values, higher taxes result from the restoration. Tax policies should be revised to permit the remission, for a period of 5 years, of tax increases which would otherwise result from restoration work.

Corporate and personal income tax regulations provide certain tax advantages associated with the construction of new
commercial buildings. Depreciation write-off is the chief advantage. Unfortunately, this same advantage is not available when an old commercial building is restored. The City should work through its representatives at the State and National levels to get tax policies revised to offer the same tax advantages to those who restore old buildings as are currently available to those who build new ones.

Revolving Fund.

The City should establish a revolving fund for historic preservation purposes. From the fund, low-interest loans could be made to the owners of historic buildings, to finance restoration work. In those instances where no other means of saving a historic building could be found, the new historic building commission could purchase it, using the revolving fund, and sell it to a nonprofit agency with experience in restoration work, such as Historic Charleston Foundation. In other cases, the purchase of a less-than-fee interest might be advisable.

The fund would be replenished by gifts, by federal revenue-sharing monies, by repayment of the low-interest restoration loans, by the sale of historic properties, and by such other monies as may become available for the purpose.

Other Programs.

Downtown Revitalization: Among the downtown commercial buildings can be found some of the most interesting buildings in Charleston. It is vital to Charleston's "image" that these buildings be preserved. If they are to be preserved, downtown Charleston must remain in a strong competitive position in retail sales and services. Downtown businesses draw support from each other, and actions taken by one businessman can have a profound effect on his fellow merchants. It follows that downtown merchants and property owners must work together for the good of all. This calls for a strong well-staffed association of downtown businessmen. The association should bring its influence to bear to implement the improvement of building facades and the coordinated paint color schemes prepared by this consulting team in 1973. Recommendations were drawn up, building by building, as to which components of the facade should be retained and preserved, which should be removed, and which should be restored. These recommendations, and simple sketches of each building, were presented in a separate report to the City.

The paint colors were selected to create a variety of schemes appropriate to the architectural variety found downtown, but within an overall harmonious color range.

More offstreet parking spaces are needed, to reduce traffic congestion and as a convenience to shoppers. The City has made a start in providing a supply of offstreet spaces by planning for a multi-level parking deck on St. Phillip Street. The City should continue its efforts to provide publicly owned off-street parking facilities, and the association should lend its support by purchasing bonds to finance these facilities. As the supply of offstreet parking spaces increases, curb parking should be prohibited on many streets, notably St. Philip Street, in order to increase the traffic-carrying capacity. Curb parking should also be prohibited on King Street (when off-street spaces become available), to provide room for wider landscaped sidewalks.

In recent years, overhead wires have been removed from lower King Street. This was an important first step in revitalizing the King Street business district. The rehabilitation of buildings will be another great stride. However, it must be realized that, while the restoration of individual buildings will upgrade the visual and architectural character of the street scene, restoration alone will not solve all the problems facing the downtown area. The restoration of individual buildings must be a part of an overall rehabilitation program dealing with traffic, parking, signs, lighting, sidewalks, street furniture and landscaping. The interiors of buildings must also be rehabilitated. If the downtown area is to retain its pre-eminent position as a regional retail center.

The association should assist merchants in mounting concerted promotional efforts, and in better merchandising generally, aggressive and continuing efforts should be made to seek quality stores nationwide, and persuade them to open stores in downtown Charleston.

In summary, downtown Charleston must provide amenities which will enable it to compete with outlying shopping areas. This is not to say that the downtown area should be made over in the image of a shopping center. Rather, the historic and architectural qualities of downtown Charleston should be the central feature of a revitalization program. It is a unique area - one which no shopping center can ever measure up to in variety of form and richness of architectural detail.
Rehabilitation and redevelopment of other areas. If an adequate revolving fund is set up, the restoration of historic properties can be greatly aided. However, there are many deteriorated houses in the Study Area which have little historic value, yet provide basically sound housing. Some owners of such properties cannot afford to rehabilitate them. Thus, they continue to deteriorate and exert a blighting influence on nearby buildings, including those with historic significance.

In the past, federally-assisted rehabilitation programs have been available. The programs included low-interest loans and, for low-income families, outright grants to help finance the rehabilitation of residential properties. Although federal programs are being studied by the Congress, and the manner in which funds are distributed will most likely be changed, it is anticipated that there will continue to be federal assistance for community improvement efforts. Charleston should use its share of these funds in a concerted effort to rehabilitate the blighted areas of the Old City.

In some sections of the Study Area, particularly north of Calhoun Street, there are pockets of blight so severe that rehabilitation would be infeasible. Other areas are so impacted by adverse environmental conditions that they are unsuited for residences (for example, near the elevated portion of the Crosstown Expressway). Clearance and redevelopment is called for in these areas.

The City has the administrative mechanism and technical know-how needed to carry out programs of rehabilitation, and of clearance and redevelopment. Experience has been gained in the Municipal Auditorium land acquisition program (Urban Renewal) and the St. Philip Street parking garage program (Neighborhood Development Program). This know-how and experience should be put to work in other portions of the Study Area. The most immediate need is in the area bounded by the Crosstown Expressway and Meeting, Calhoun and East Bay Streets; and the entire quadrant lying west of St. Philip Street and north of Calhoun Street, excluding the medical complex. In the latter area, consideration should be given to the need for expansion of the Medical University of South Carolina and other health facilities.

**Code Enforcement:** Code enforcement is closely related to rehabilitation programs. The City should continually reassess its codes and ordinances, and the methods of implementing them. Building codes often lag behind new product development and modern construction techniques. They should be continually reviewed to make sure they do not hamper efforts to provide better housing for low- and moderate-income families.

The City's Housing Code, which sets minimum standards for continued occupancy of existing dwellings, must be vigorously enforced. The Housing Code is perhaps the most valuable regulatory measure available to the City in its efforts to prevent the further deterioration of dwellings, including those with historic significance. In addition, Housing Codes can bring about the correction of major structural deficiencies. Aside from the benefits to the historic preservation program, improved housing for many families will result.

**Special Design Studies.** Fourth of the waterfront surrounding the Study Area has an uninviting or, at best, neutral appearance. In view of the great visual potential of the Ashley and Cooper River waterfronts, this is a remarkable neglect of a unique asset.

Design studies should be prepared to illustrate these potentials. They should be three-dimensional studies to demonstrate urban design principles specifically applied to the waterfronts. The Cooper River study area should include the area lying east of East Bay Street from South Cooper's marina to the Crosstown Expressway. This should be a cooperative effort with the Ports Authority. On the Ashley River side, the study should cover the area from (and including) the Coast Guard Station northward to the Expressway and extending inland to include the large vacant tracts along Barke Street (from Montague Street southward) and the Yacht Basin Lake.

A design study is also needed for the corridor between King and Meeting Streets, including the properties fronting on both sides of King and Meeting Streets. This area is characterized by a mixture of building types (many with great historic significance) and land uses, warehouses, residences, retail outlets and industries vie for space. The central spine of this corridor consists of railroad tracks with many sidings and spurs. Much of the railroad right-of-way is underutilized.
Design studies of these three areas could be the catalyst for their revitalization. They could stir the imagination of property-owners, entrepreneurs and the general public.

Such studies should be more than flights of the imagination, although imaginative treatment of these areas is very much needed. The design studies should be well-grounded in analyses of economic potential and all other factors influencing physical development.
THE EXCHANGE BUILDING

The Exchange Building, situated on axis with Broad Street at the East Bay Street intersection, has played a unique and central role in Charleston’s history. Its original use was for civic and commercial purposes. Since its completion in 1771, it has been used for the storage of gunpowder, as a prison, as the site of a gala ball attended by President George Washington, as a meeting place for the South Carolina House of Representatives, as a Custom House, a Post Office and a Coast Guard station, and since 1917, as a historical memorial owned and maintained by the Rebecca Motte Chapter of the South Carolina Daughters of the American Revolution.

The Exchange Building has been called South Carolina’s Independence Hall. In a sense, the government of the State linearly descended from a meeting held in the Exchange Building on December 3, 1773 to protest the Tea Act. It is regarded by one architectural authority as the most important Palladian-style building constructed in colonial America. It is probably the only extant colonial Custom House of its type within the boundaries of the former British Empire.

During the 200 years of its existence, the building has undergone extensive alterations which have substantially changed its appearance. Originally, the first floor was an open, arcaded piazza. In the nineteenth century the arcade openings were filled in with windows and doors. When East Bay Street was widened early in the nineteenth century, the original stair bays which projected from the west facade of the building were removed. The cupola which originally graced the roof of the building was removed at an undetermined date prior to 1817. A second cupola was completed in 1835, but removed after it was badly damaged by an earthquake in 1886. A cornice, including parapets and decorative urns, was also removed in the nineteenth century because of earthquake damage. Many interior “modernizations” were made in the nineteenth century, particularly in the second floor Great Hall.

In 1973, the City of Charleston and the South Carolina Department of Archives and History commissioned a comprehensive study to determine the best method of restoring the building to its former architectural splendor to commemorate the American Bicentennial. One objective of the study was to evaluate the effect of replacing the stair bays on the traffic-carrying capacity of East Bay Street, a major artery. Extensive physical and documentary evidence was uncovered as to the original appearance of the building.

The stair bays at the northwest and southwest corners of the building originally projected fifteen feet from the west facade. The reason for their removal (sometime between 1805 and 1822) was the increased traffic on East Bay Street, indicating the necessity to widen the street. Since the traffic demands of the twentieth century are even greater than those of the nineteenth, the obvious dilemma is: how can the stair bays be authentically replaced without seriously disrupting traffic in the vicinity?

Information was gathered by City Planning and Architectural Associates of Chapel Hill, North Carolina about all aspects of the Exchange Building in relation to its immediate environment. The location, height, use, size and condition of surrounding buildings was measured noted and mapped. The dimensions of surrounding streets and sidewalks were measured. Peak-hour traffic volumes were counted. The width of traffic lanes and the location of pavement markings and traffic control devices were determined and mapped.

In the meantime, the building was inspected inside and outside by National Heritage Corporation under the direction of its president, Mr. John D. Milner, an experienced preservation architect. The condition of the building was determined and the physical remains of former architectural features were noted. Old sketches, paintings and maps were examined. References to the building in old newspaper articles, reminiscences and other manuscripts were reviewed. Fortunately, the original building plans and elevations, dated December 10, 1766, have been preserved.

When all these materials had been assimilated, a proposal for the restoration of the Exchange Building was formulated. The proposal calls for a thorough and accurate restoration of the Exchange Building, except that the two stair bays would be constructed to project 11 feet from the west facade instead of 15 feet as originally built. The stair and stair wells would be constructed to their original size, however, by recessing them four feet into the arcaded piazza. The reduced projection of the bays would leave enough space for East Bay Street to provide for all the traffic movements which presently occur at the intersection, except for the westbound vehicles approaching from the south leg of East Bay Street. This turning movement, which is relatively small in volume, is recommended to be prohibited. A minor portion of the property at the northwest corner of the intersection is recommended for acquisition to provide a longer turning radius for buses and other large vehicles. Sidewalks on the west side of East Bay Street, which are now 9 to 11 feet wide, would be narrowed by approximately two feet.

This proposal is subject to approval by the Rebecca Motte Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution and funds being made available from several sources. If this can be done, the Exchange Building will once again preside over Broad and East Bay Street with dignity and grace. No restoration project could be more fitting as a Bicentennial commemoration since the Exchange Building played such a prominent part in the American Revolution, and in the dramatic events leading up to the Revolution.
CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

The citizens of Charleston played a central and vital role in the Historic Architecture Inventory and in the preparation of the Historic Preservation Plan. As the section of this report entitled “Historic Architecture Inventory” relates, the role of local citizens included some of the actual “legwork.” Volunteers from Historic Charleston Foundation, the Junior League and the Harleston Village Association surveyed the interiors of many buildings. Later, representatives of these and other organizations reviewed draft copies of the inventory materials and made numerous recommendations which were incorporated in the published inventory.

The preparation of the Historic Preservation Plan began with in-depth interviews with a wide variety of local citizens. For the most part, these were representatives of agencies which control major areas of land in the Study Area. For example, representatives of the College of Charleston, the Medical University of South Carolina and the South Carolina State Ports Authority were interviewed. The purpose of these interviews was to determine the extent of present land holdings and plans for future expansion, if any. Since most of these representatives had an intimate knowledge of development patterns and problems in the Study Area, their personal comments were extremely valuable to the planning process.

All individuals contacted gave freely of their time and opened their files. In this way, a wealth of information was gathered on land use, traffic patterns, commercial trends, population shifts, utilities, topography, surface hydrology and — perhaps most important — the physical, cultural, social and political history of Charleston.

Other data — such as building conditions — were not available on an individual building basis. This data was gathered by surveying the entire Study Area building by building.

Personal interviews were conducted with representatives of neighborhood improvement association and preservation groups to get their comments on neighborhood problems and potentials. These individuals revealed a remarkable depth of understanding of the political, economic and cultural forces at work in Charleston. Their comments were wide-ranging and free-swinging. Their candor and openness brought forth many suggestions which are an integral part of the Historic Preservation Plan.

Throughout the study, regularly scheduled meetings were held with a steering committee consisting of the Planning and Zoning Commission, Mayor Gaillard, the Board of Architectural Review, representatives of historic preservation groups and the Berkeley-Charleston-Dorchester Regional Planning Council. The City’s staff and consultants. At these meetings, the progress and direction of the Historic Preservation Plan was discussed in depth. A draft of this report was reviewed by the Steering Committee.

Toward the end of the study period, a widely-publicized community forum was conducted. At the forum, which covered an entire day, all resource materials and planning recommendations were displayed and explained. The City’s staff and consultants who played a part in preparing the materials attended the forum and answered questions.

Each interested group and many individuals presented comments and suggestions which were later reduced to writing and furnished to the Planning and Zoning Commission and the consultants for consideration in formulating the final plan.
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