In this Special Report of Preservation Progress, we have collected and reprinted a series of letters, position statements and related documents that will bring you up to date and provide context to the ongoing debate about the need to responsibly manage cruise tourism in Charleston.

“The residents who maintain their homes and gardens deserve the community’s consideration and the city’s protection. We can have a viable tourist economy and a high quality of life in our Old and Historic District ... [but] this requires careful thought and coordinated protection.”

Mayor Joseph P. Riley, Jr., June 2, 1979

The 2,056 passenger Carnival Fantasy docks at Union Pier on a recent summer afternoon in front of the Custom House.
In the early 20th century, steamships provided Charleston with an important form of transportation. These steamships connected Charleston and its residents to the wider world. They did not come to Charleston to entertain the region with self-contained tourist vacation experiences.

In February 1942, “Charleston’s last passenger terminal was closed... when the Clyde-Mallory Steamship Line ended its coastwise passenger service.” For the next three decades, Charleston was without a dedicated passenger terminal. An occasional ocean liner would visit Charleston and dock at a cargo facility along the Cooper River; however, discussions began in the 1960s about how Charleston could more regularly serve “luxury liners plying to Bermuda and the Caribbean.”

An initial proposal in 1961 called for a terminal to be built at North Adger’s Wharf. This location was abandoned in part because there wasn’t enough money to build a terminal and the city wanted to “keep the lower half of the... waterfront clear of commercial type construction,” despite its history as an active part of the city’s passenger ship business.

Later attention focused on Fleet Landing. In 1964, discussions between the State Ports Authority (SPA) and the Navy resulted in preliminary agreements to build a new passenger terminal at the site while using the old Fleet Landing building as a “clearing house for customs and immigration.” This plan never materialized.

The current passenger terminal at Union Pier was built by Ruscon Construction Co. and completed in December 1972. Several years of planning and fundraising for the $1.2 million facility preceded construction. SPA Chairman W.W. Johnson said the terminal would be a “significant tourist economic boom” to South Carolina. A growing recreational cruise industry was cited as the reason for building the facility, with cruise business growing from a total of 729 passengers in 1969 to 7,310 in 1972 on 13 cruise ships.

In February 1973, news broke that three out of the eight passenger cruises planned for the new terminal that year were cancelled. The first ship to dock at Union Pier’s new terminal did not arrive until April 1973, when the M.S. DeGrosse of the French Line was “sold out” with 557 passengers taking a cruise to Jamaica and Nassau.

Rising oil prices and an economic recession turned visions of cruise business growth and its benefits into false hopes. In 1977, the News and Courier reported that “the passenger ship terminal was dusted off... for an infrequent happening: the departure of a passenger ship;” and noted that people had dubbed the facility “an expensive and unsuccessful white elephant.” In 1978, thought was given to converting the passenger terminal to a visitor center but another location between Meeting and King streets was chosen, in part because of the need to divert traffic away from an already crowded lower peninsula.

**Did You Know?**

In 1920, the same year the Preservation Society was founded, Charleston was served by at least seven steamship companies including the Clyde Steamship Company, the Carolina Company, the Baltimore and Carolina Steamship Company, the Charleston Shipping Company, the Luckenbach Line, the Cuban-Atlantic Transport Company and the South Atlantic Maritime Corporation.

Source: News and Courier, May 21, 1920
In the late 1980s, as the SPA was considering its long-term options, Mayor Riley spoke of the community benefits that would result from the conversion of Union Pier to non-maritime uses. On May 1, 1989, an article in the News and Courier reported that the Mayor believed:

"if Union Pier were put to residential, commercial and institutional uses it would have an 'extraordinary impact' on the city, providing an additional tax base running into the hundreds of millions of dollars; he says. Tax revenues would be in the millions of dollars and the general area would undergo a massive facelift. Riley figures the property's value 'easily' at $2 million an acre."

A decade later, the cruise business began to increase. The problem of traffic congestion in the summer of 2000 from a single cruise ship docked at Union Pier was minimized by the Mayor in a July 9th article in the Spartanburg Herald-Journal: "This happens only three days a year ... This is not a city where blind boosterism has a foothold. This is a city where we need to be very shrewd and strategic and careful about how we develop it." In 2002, thirty-two ships called on Charleston. In 2011, it will be eighty-nine.

Did You Know?

Cruise ship visits were so infrequent during the 1980s that on May 19, 1986, the Preservation Society organized a walking tour for passengers and crew of the SS Norway followed by a "Champagne Gala" at the Old Exchange. Though smaller than today's Carnival Fantasy, it was at that time the "world's largest ship" Source: Preservation Progress, March 1986 and May 1986

Did You Know?

In the Post and Courier on February 26, 2003, Mayor Riley "said the city would act to limit cruise ships if that became necessary, just as it has taken steps to limit carriage tours and other activities. 'I think we have a duty, if it was approaching a level that was damaging,' he said."
STATE PORTS AUTHORITY

JUNE 25, 2010: REGULATION BY CORRESPONDENCE

STATE PORTS AUTHORITY

JUNE 25, 2010

The Honorable Joseph P. Riley, Jr.
Mayor, City of Charleston
PO Box 523
Charleston, SC 29402

Dear Mayor Riley,

I thought it might be helpful for us to put in writing some thoughts and commitments about the cruise business in Charleston.

As you well know, the State Ports Authority’s economic development mandate is fundamental to its founding legislation. While fulfilling that mission, we need to respect the interests of our neighbors and the special character of this great city.

Welcoming cruise ships – something the port and Charleston have done for more than three decades – is certainly consistent with our mission to catalyze economic vitality. Cruise ships provide jobs and economic activity for many workers and businesses throughout the local economy. We are fortunate that Charleston has attracted some of the world’s most highly respected cruise lines, and the community is already benefiting from their significant positive economic contributions.

Cruise ships can also present special challenges: managing automobile and pedestrian traffic, coordinating cruise ship operations with popular local events that attract more people to the peninsula, protecting the environment, and preserving Charleston’s unique character, which is the reason cruise ships and their guests want to come here in the first place.

We have been working closely with you and the community to address these challenges. Much progress has been made. Our collaborative Union Pier Concept Plan process provided an opportunity to actively engage the community and create a plan that is truly responsive to their needs.

The community reconvened to think beyond the existing passenger terminal site, expand our study area, and relocate the passenger terminal further north on the property. All of these recommendations are included in our Concept Plan, which provides several benefits:

- Automobile and pedestrian traffic could be accommodated much more easily.
- Relocating cargo operations would be moved out of the Union Pier Terminal.
- About 200 cargo ships would no longer come in and out of that terminal.

Benefits cited by Newsome:

- Better automobile and pedestrian traffic management
- Relocation of cargo operations
- Redevelopment of unused portions of the Union Pier property
- Restoration of the Custom House wharf
- Retaining” the Bennett Rice Mill façade in place
- Enhancing view corridors
- Providing public access and open space

Did You Know?

The News and Courier quoted Mayor Riley on October 28, 1984,”When we were drawing up the Tourism Management Ordinance, we wanted to limit the number of carriages and buses downtown. Our attorneys advised us we couldn’t do it without federal law that could be construed as an effort to restrict trade. I would strongly support limiting the number of carriages and buses.”

JULY 27, 2010: THE SOCIETY TAKES A STAND

AFTER HEARING A PRESENTATION BY SPA PRESIDENT NEWSOME AND TAKING A TOUR OF THE UNION PIE R PROPERTY BY BYRON MILLER, THE SPA’S VICE PRESIDENT FOR MARKETING, THE PRESERVATION SOCIETY’S BOARD OF DIRECTORS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED A RESOLUTION ON JULY 27, 2010 CALLING FOR REASONABLE REGULATIONS, OPERATIONAL TRANSPARENCY, APPROPRIATE REDEVELOPMENT OF UNION PI ER AND STABILIZATION OF THE BENNET RICE MILL FACADE.

The society also outlined a list of ten recommendations for sustainable cruise ship tourism, which included:

- Limiting the number of cruise ships and passengers on a daily and annual basis
- Reaffirming SPA commitment to abide by local zoning ordinances
- Establishing a remote parking facility
- Directing pedestrians away from Ansonborough
- Banning “late departure” offerings by cruise lines
- Creating a Marine Passenger Fund

Did You Know?

Last year, the Preservation Society identified for the SPA a state grant opportunity that was awarded to the SPA to prepare engineering plans for the Bennett Rice Mill. The Society wrote a letter of support to the SPA, copied to Mayor Riley, on January 21, 2011. The grant application indicated that a nomination would be made to include the Bennett Rice Mill façade on the National Register of Historic Places.
City Council unanimously passed a resolution on September 14, 2010 endorsing the Union Pier redevelopment concept and gave its blessing to the cruise ships despite the lack of any local regulations. The resolution made no specific reference to redevelopment of the southern end of Union Pier, only that immediately upon opening of a new passenger terminal “the SPA and the City will work on new public access to the waterfront.”

The Preservation Society's Executive Director Evan R. Thompson joined a chorus of public comment expressing concern, stating that it was the responsibility of the City Council and Mayor to “establish written, enforceable, responsible, reasonable limits on cruise tourism.”

Did You Know?

A 2003 City of Charleston Cruise Ship Task Force recommended limiting the size of ships, establishing a remote parking facility to keep traffic out of downtown, and implementing a passenger fee with revenue directed to the City to cover the cost of public services related to cruise tourism. As of today, the City of Charleston receives $0.

---

City Council Minutes
September 14, 2010

Remarks by Evan R. Thompson,
Executive Director of the Preservation Society of Charleston

“I am the Executive Director of the Preservation Society of Charleston and I am honored to speak on behalf of our Board of Directors and over 1,500 members, and to recognize the vision of the Mayor and the City for historic preservation. It affords us the opportunity to meet in a beautiful building such as this one. We are celebrating our 90th anniversary this year. We take a long view of things and one thing we have learned over these last 90 years is an organization is that in order to sustain our quality of life, we need to manage tourism. It is something that we are noted for as a City and I think that we should continue. We recognize the economic value of the Port. We also recognize the value of tourism to our community. But the most important economic engine downtown is historic preservation.

It’s what ties us together and the biggest beneficiary of the cruise industry is Carnival Cruise Lines and these profits sail off into the Atlantic. We feel where our mission overlaps with the Ports Authority in support of preservation, we can work very well together, for instance, with the Bennett Rice Mill. But we have serious concerns about the Ports Authority’s reluctance to accept any limitations on the number and size and scale of the tourism business. We believe that it is the responsibility of you, as City Council and as Mayor to establish written, enforceable, responsible, reasonable limits on cruise tourism so we can ensure [the balance between] tourism [and] the quality of life and sustain historic preservation in our City for the long-term and so we urge you to so resolve. Thank you.”

---

City of Charleston City Council Minutes
September 14, 2010

Remarks by Evan R. Thompson,
Executive Director of the Preservation Society of Charleston

September 14, 2010

Remarks by Evan R. Thompson,
Executive Director of the Preservation Society of Charleston
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City Council authorized the inclusion of language in its Century V 2010 Comprehensive Plan Update on February 22, 2011 as follows:

The burgeoning cruise ship industry will help the sector continue to grow. Early in 2010 Carnival Cruise Lines began sailing its ship Carnival Fantasy out of Charleston harbor every five to seven days. This represents more than 60 annual port calls that will bring visitors to downtown Charleston. In addition, the SC State Ports Authority is undertaking a major redevelopment of the cruise ship terminal and the surrounding property at Union Pier. The new passenger terminal will make the operation much more efficient and reduce local impacts while opening about 35 acres to non-maritime redevelopment.

Robert Gurley, Assistant Director of the Preservation Society, went on record at City Council raising concern about the conclusory nature of the language of the plan:

“We...share concerns about the negative impacts of the cruise industry. We are also concerned about that language in the Comprehensive 2010 Plan Update...the impacts are not known. We haven’t had that public discussion; we haven’t had that data gathered. We commend the Historic Charleston Foundation for working on...collecting that data. We feel that is prejudicial to have a statement in the Comprehensive Plan, which is a city-guiding document that suggests a lessening of impacts when we really don’t know that yet. So, we don’t think it’s appropriate for it to be in this document at this time.” City Council Minutes, February 22, 2011

Did You Know?

Improvements to Union Pier are long overdue. In 1974, the City of Charleston’s Historic Preservation Plan pointed out that “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 crossties, even castoff automobile tires lie beside the street and on private property... Even the surface of Concord Street is unsightly. Potholes, railroad tracks and broken pavement edges mar its appearance and give motorists a rough ride... A unique natural resource such as the Cooper River should not be regarded as a merchandisable commodity. Its enjoyment should be guaranteed to the citizens of Charleston.”

In response to the ongoing debate in the community, the Preservation Society of Charleston released a new position statement on March 30, 2011 “renewing the call for cruise tourism regulations” and urging a restudy of the final location of the proposed new passenger terminal.

MARCH 30, 2011: RENEWING THE CALL

RENEWING THE CALL FOR CRUISE TOURISM REGULATIONS AND RESODY OF FINAL TERMINAL LOCATION

March 30, 2011

A recent citizen-driven proposal to move the location of a new cruise passenger terminal to the State Ports Authority’s Columbus Street Terminal has raised the concerns of residents and neighborhood groups. Whether it is the Charleston Historic and Ancient Borough neighborhoods, the Historic District, or the Cooper River and nearby neighborhoods, the community stands united in its opposition to this proposal.

The State Ports Authority has failed to meet its obligation to this community by not involving the community in the decision-making process. This is a short-sighted view that ignores the market reality that there is greater demand for cruise tourism in Charleston than any other metropolitan area in the country. We applaud the City for its leadership on this issue. In March 2011, the City released the RENEWING THE CALL FOR CRUISE TOURISM REGULATIONS and renewed its call for clear and reasonable regulations that will protect the community and our historic properties.

We are working together as a city to improve and maintain the quality of life of all of our historic neighborhoods, and to work with our residents and neighborhood associations to ensure that the community is heard and that the city government is held accountable for the decisions that affect our community.”

William Amherst Vanderbilt Cecil, Biltmore Estate, October 18,
A
fter a meeting with Mayor Riley on April 5, 2011 to outline concerns about unregulated cruise tourism in Charleston, the Preservation Society’s leadership sent a letter to the Mayor reaffirming its concerns while expressing support for the Port of Charleston.

**APRIL 11, 2011: A LETTER TO THE MAYOR**

**JUNE 13, 2011: TURNING TO THE COURTS**

Seeing no way forward in the pursuit of regulation without a judicial ruling on the applicability of local ordinances to cruise ships, on June 13, 2011, the Preservation Society of Charleston joined with the Historic Ansonborough Neighborhood Association, Charleston Village Neighborhood Association and the Coastal Conservation League as plaintiffs in a lawsuit against Panama-Canal-Carnival Corporation. Filed in state court, the legal action contends, in part, that large cruise ship home-porting operations run afoul of local zoning ordinances. The Society retained John A. Marsala, Esq. as its attorney. The plaintiffs subsequently consented to a request by the City of Charleston and the SPA to intervene as defendants in the suit.

**Did You Know?**

On October 28, 1979, the News and Courier quoted Mayor Riley: “We absolutely have the power to help insure the quality of life for our residential areas. The citizens of the residential areas deserve protection. This is not a passing fancy. If those who are in the business of operating tour vehicles don’t believe that we should have this authority, they’re sadly mistaken because what the people come to see in Charleston is a restored residential area. We must protect this residential area against an unreasonable degree of tour buses and non-residential activities.”

On July 20, 1992, the Supreme Court of South Carolina ruled that the SPA had to comply with local zoning ordinances, and that if the SPA refused to comply the City of Charleston could seek an injunction in circuit court. The City of Charleston sought such an injunction against the SPA in 1991 to stop construction of a building for which the SPA had not received approval from the Board of Architectural Review.

**Source:** City of Charleston vs. South Carolina State Ports Authority (309 S.C. 118, 420 S.E.2d 497).
The National Trust for Historic Preservation responded to growing concern among preservationists in Charleston and across the country about the potential impact of unregulated cruise ships in Charleston by placing the city on a "watch status." This step resulted from a nomination by the Preservation Society, a Local Partner of the National Trust, to that organization's 2011 Most Endangered List. In years past, the National Trust listed the Ashley River Historic District (1995), Gullah-Geechee Coast (2004) and the Philip Simmons Workshop and Home (2007) on its 11 Most Endangered List.

**NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

For the first time in its history, the list has been supplemented with a site placed on "Watch Status": the city of Charleston.

The Watch Status means that a specific threat to a historic site appears to be growing, but can be avoided or controlled through collaboration and innovation. In the case of Charleston, expanding cruise ship tourism could jeopardize the historic character of the city, historic downtown Charleston and its surrounding neighborhoods. The Watch Status designation is accompanied by an offer from the National Trust to assist with finding a balanced solution that benefits the community and its rich cultural heritage.

While there are many proposals at play in Charleston cruise tourism issue, including relocation of the cruise docking pier, the National Trust believes that defining enforceable limits on the size, number and frequency of cruise ships visiting the downtown piers is central to a positive resolution. The National Trust wants to play a constructive role in helping clarify the options available.

- **Helping sponsor a Tomism h npact Study for C h arleston.**
- **Launching a Community Forum on Cruise Tourism.**
- **Funding an Enforcement Authority Legal Review.**
- **Providing a grant to help defray costs.**
- **By Evan R. Thompson on Thursday, July 14, 2011.**

Historic preservation is the voluntary investment of millions of dollars of private capital and thousands of hours of sweat equity by property owners and tenants into historic buildings every year, from the Shadrack Young House from the Westside to Windermere. It is also the proverbial golden-egg-laying goose. In addition to creating hundreds of jobs for tradesmen and professionals of all kinds, it generates millions of dollars in economic benefits to the Charleston region as well as sales, accommodations, hospitality and property tax revenue. Preservation sustains a globally significant built environment that draws millions of tourists to our streets every year. Yet the scale of Charleston's small peninsula and streets is not expandable. While some see downtown as a limitless pie in the sky of tourist dollars and hotel rooms, there is a tipping point where downtown, Charleston will cease to be a viable and sustainable residential place.

The National Trust believes that a positive, solution-oriented approach to the issues surrounding the city of Charleston is the only viable solution.

"We believe that the past preservation work in Charleston has made this community a national treasure and we are willing to dedicate resources to help address questions about the impact of cruise tourism," said Stephanie Meeks, president of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. "We understand that Charleston presents a complex set of issues in what is now an emotionally-charged environment and want to define and support a solution rather than simply identify the problem." - National Trust for Historic Preservation

**The Post and Courier**

**Historic preservation requires balanced cruise controls**

BY EVAN R. THOMPSON

Thursday, July 14, 2011

Historic preservation is the voluntary investment of millions of dollars of private capital and thousands of hours of sweat equity by property owners and tenants into historic buildings every year, from the Shadrack Young House from the Westside to Windermere. It is also the proverbial golden-egg-laying goose. In addition to creating hundreds of jobs for tradesmen and professionals of all kinds, it generates millions of dollars in economic benefits to the Charleston region as well as sales, accommodations, hospitality and property tax revenue. Preservation sustains a globally significant built environment that draws millions of tourists to our streets every year. Yet the scale of Charleston's small peninsula and streets is not expandable. While some see downtown as a limitless pie in the sky of tourist dollars and hotel rooms, there is a tipping point where downtown, Charleston will cease to be a viable and sustainable residential place.

The balance that has been achieved between the residential qualities of our neighborhoods, privately maintained but publicly enjoyed, and the tourist industry that brings so many jobs to Charleston has inspired limitations on the scale and placement of hotels, the numbers of carriages, tour buses and pedicabs on our streets, and even the size of walking tours. This balance of scale in tourism is no different than efforts by our Board of Architectural Review to balance the scale of new buildings. None of this has been achieved voluntarily or by accident. It is deliberate, and governed by Local ordinances. When the tourist year by local ordinance counts, transportation is physically bigger than anything that tourists come to see, that is not balance.

The Preservation Society of Charleston is proud of Charleston's maritime history. It built this city. But that should not give cruise ships a free pass from the thoughtful, locally enforced regulatory framework that is essential to protecting our city's neighborhoods. Recent spin to the contrary, the ship is not cargo ships, which have coexisted with our city at Union Pier for decades. This is about the conversion of a cargo port to a tourist port, with cruise ships carrying thousands of passengers visiting nearly 100 times per year - a new and unprecedented development in Charleston's history. Would a big box store be appropriate on King Street just because we have a history of retail downtown? Mass tourism is what it is: an opportunity fraught with overweening size of the tourist industry, or to make Union Pier the most remarkable new neighborhood on the Atlantic seaboard. Why can't we choose both?

Mist we sacrifice one for the other?

As preservationists we understand that Charleston is diverse, complex and inextricably linked to its maritime past. We do not involve ourselves in this issue because we seek to befuddled nags. We are involved because we love our city. We seek to protect a city that anchors our region and is worthy of the world. Cruise tourism is welcome as part of our local tourism management framework.

We have enough seen of what has happened in the past to know that while tourism management is not always easy, the short term, it is worth doing in the end. Charleston deserves nothing less.

Reprinted with Permission from the Post & Courier.
O n July 18, 2011, after an extended period of public input, the SPA unveiled its design for the proposed new cruise terminal at Union Pier. The new terminal would adapt an existing warehouse by replacing its facade, adding clerestory windows to the roof and modifying the Cooper River facade in a manner reminiscent of the old terminal. The site plan called for the terminal to drop anchor at the foot of Laurens Street in a sea of surface parking, buoyed by trees.

Cruise ships and a full parking lot are noticeably absent from the SPA's renderings of the proposed new Union Pier cruise terminal.

The proposed Cooper River facade is no improvement over the existing cruise terminal.

**Remarks by Preservation Society Assistant Director Robert Garley at the B.A.R. meeting on August 10, 2011.**

This project involves a highly visible adaptive use of an existing, non-historic warehouse structure. As built, the warehouse building is not an architectural asset of the community. It is in a highly visible part of the city from both land and water and will be visited by thousands of people. It will set the tone for the redevelopment of Union Pier overall. Accordingly, every effort should be made to mitigate and diminish the strictly utilitarian nature of the structure to the fullest extent possible. We feel that the concept plan under consideration will be visited by thousands of people.

### East (Cooper River) Façade
1. The Cooper River waterfront façade, or east façade, fails to establish this building as an important public structure.
2. As this façade is essentially new construction, it provides an opportunity to design a public waterfront façade in keeping with the best of Charleston's historic maritime architecture.
3. The proposed use of tall, square columns in rectangular forms gives the unfinished appearance of freestanding scaffolding and uncannily recalls the current Union Pier Terminal or, more generally, the garage areas of industrial structures.
4. The use of brick, stone and stucco, with arched openings and expanses of glass will go a long way to obscuring the existing warehouse form of the proposed terminal and better integrate the building with Charleston's waterfront architectural heritage.

### West (Concord Street) Façade
5. This façade is equally important as it will be the side of the building most visible to residents and passers-by on land.
6. Ideally, this façade would serve as the principal entrance to the facility.
7. The proposed design simply exaggerates the existing warehouse form of the structure through the addition of linteled gables more appropriate for a shed or garage than a large, highly visible public building.
8. Again, this façade affords an opportunity through the use of brick, stone and stucco, as well as arched openings to better integrate the building with Charleston's waterfront architectural heritage.

### South Façade
9. Ideally, the principal entrance to this facility would be on the west façade, although the central canopy entrance as proposed for the south façade does a good job of breaking up the monolithic massing of this long façade.
10. The provision of covered areas for passengers is an important and strong element of the design.

### North Façade
11. It appears that very little effort has been made to hide the warehouse form of the present structure on its north façade.
12. The design of the supply shelter on the northern portion of the lot exacerbates the lack of thought given to this façade through the use of structural supports best left on the inside of a building, rather than exposed to wide open view from the river.
13. More screening should be provided to obscure the view of this façade from the river.

### Materials
14. There should be a greater use of brick and stone, particularly on the east and west façades, to better integrate this building and establish it as part of the continuum of brick maritime structures along the waterfront.
15. The use of tabby on this building is not appropriate, particularly in that historic lobby was stuccoed over, not left unfinished with visible shells, and not typically used in this part of the city.

### Overall Plan
16. The height of the building is appropriate, as waterfront structures are typically lower in profile than buildings located in more central portions of the peninsula.
17. The additional height needed for functional purposes on the east façade is also appropriate.
18. The addition of clerestory windows to the building's roof is commendable.
19. We continue to urge the property owner to minimize surface parking on this site.
20. The integration of shelters for shuttles is commendable.
21. The construction of freestanding covered parking/drop-off areas along the waterfront is not appropriate because of their high visibility and they should be relocated elsewhere on the property.
22. We commend the SPA's commitment to planting as many trees as possible on this site.
23. We urge that additional trees be planted closer to the water's edge to obscure the large surface parking lot proposed for the southern portion of the terminal property.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide input into this important public project and request that this application be deferred.
OCTOBER 16, 2011: THE MAYOR’S ORDINANCE

On August 16, 2011, after over a year of community debate, Mayor Riley proposed an ordinance relating to cruise tourism for the first time. This ordinance would amend city tourism regulations to establish a formal process for community input if the SPA sought to amplify its cruise operations. The proposal is flawed as it provides no legal mechanism for the City to prevent an unreasonable increase in the size, scale or frequency of cruise ships in Charleston. The Society’s position was delivered to City Council by Assistant Director Robert Gurlay. The Preservation Society of Charleston believes that the proposed amendment to the City’s Tourism Management Ordinance to address cruise tourism is an important first step toward a workable regulatory framework. It codifies a process that provides valuable public input into future city council resolutions regarding the future growth of the cruise tourism industry. While not perfect, we feel that the proposed ordinance can be strengthened with the inclusion of specific criteria against which requests for increases in the scale or frequency of cruise tourism can be measured, so that the community can expect an objective and holistic analysis. Additionally, the Tourism Commission should be given the authority to negotiate an annual cruise visit calendar that avoids overlap of cruise visits with major community events.

In order to balance concerns expressed by our organization and others in the community, we also believe that opportunities exist to amend the city’s Zoning Ordinance to provide enforceable mechanisms to protect against unchecked future cruise tourism growth and to deal directly with challenges presented by traffic congestion and excessive surface parking at Union Pier. The proposed ordinance before council is a step in the right direction. But in the interests of ensuring that the wider concerns of the community can be addressed, we believe that it should be deferred so that amendments to both the tourism ordinance and the zoning ordinance can be given full consideration.

Did You Know?

Five out of thirteen members of City Council (Councilmen Gallant, Gregorie, Hallman, Mallard and Seekings) voted on August 16, 2011 to defer consideration of the Mayor’s ordinance in order to give more time to consider a more stringent ordinance proposed by Historic Charleston Foundation.

K HISTORIC CHARTER FOUNDATION’S LEGAL CONSULTANTS HAVE PREPARED A ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT THAT WOULD CREATE A CRUISE OVERLAY ZONE AT UNION PIER, RESTRICTING THE OPERATION OF A CRUISE TERMINAL AND LIMITING THE AMOUNT OF PERMISSIBLE SURFACE PARKING ON THE SITE, AMONG OTHER PROVISIONS.

The proposed ordinance would address almost all of the key quality of life issues raised by community proponents for reasonable cruise tourism regulations by addressing the size, scale and frequency of cruise ships.

The time is now for CRUISE CONTROL in the form of reasonable regulations to be codified in our city ordinances to protect our historic neighborhoods.

City Council will have a second reading of the Mayor’s ordinance on September 13, 2011. But Historic Charleston Foundation’s ordinance would address cruise tourism issues comprehensively, but it is not yet on Council’s agenda.

You can contact members of City Council and let them know that Historic Charleston Foundation’s proposed ordinance will adequately protect quality of life in our historic neighborhoods while allowing cruise tourism to operate at levels supported by the SPA. Visit the City’s website at www.charleston-sc.gov for contact information. In the upper left hand corner, select City Departments, Boards & Commissions. From the drop-down menu, select Clerk of Council. Finally, select City Council Members & Districts.

You can write a letter to the Post and Courier sharing your view of support in reasonable regulations that protect the delicate balance between residential quality of life and the benefits of heritage tourism. To submit a letter to the editor of the Post and Courier, email letters@postandcourier.com, or send letters to: The Editor, 134 Columbus St., Charleston, SC 29403-4800. Please include address and daytime phone number.

You can support our efforts at the Preservation Society of Charleston to educate and advocate for reasonable cruise tourism management by making a contribution to our Cruise Control Fund using the enclosed envelope or by visiting our website at www.preservationsociety.org. Pick up free Cruise Control Now stickers in our shop at 147 King Street.

Did You Know?

AUGUST 16, 2011: THE MAYOR’S ORDINANCE

The Preservation Society of Charleston believes that the proposed amendment to the City’s Tourism Management Ordinance to address cruise tourism is an important first step toward a workable regulatory framework. It codifies a process that provides valuable public input into future city council resolutions regarding the future growth of the cruise tourism industry. While not perfect, we feel that the proposed ordinance can be strengthened with the inclusion of specific criteria against which requests for increases in the scale or frequency of cruise tourism can be measured, so that the community can expect an objective and holistic analysis. Additionally, the Tourism Commission should be given the authority to negotiate an annual cruise visit calendar that avoids overlap of cruise visits with major community events.

In order to balance concerns expressed by our organization and others in the community, we also believe that opportunities exist to amend the city’s Zoning Ordinance to provide enforceable mechanisms to protect against unchecked future cruise tourism growth and to deal directly with challenges presented by traffic congestion and excessive surface parking at Union Pier.

The proposed ordinance before council is a step in the right direction. But in the interests of ensuring that the wider concerns of the community can be addressed, we believe that it should be deferred so that amendments to both the tourism ordinance and the zoning ordinance can be given full consideration.

Did You Know?

Five out of thirteen members of City Council (Councilmen Gallant, Gregorie, Hallman, Mallard and Seekings) voted on August 16, 2011 to defer consideration of the Mayor’s ordinance in order to give more time to consider a more stringent ordinance proposed by Historic Charleston Foundation.
THE ART OF ADVOCACY

SAVE CHARLESTON SUPPORT CRUISE CONTROL

READ MORE ABOUT THIS ISSUE AND READ DOCUMENTS
www.PreservationSociety.org/CruiseControl

2010 TOURISM SPENDING IMPACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>2010 TOURISM SPENDING IMPACT</th>
<th>PSC FALL TOURS of HOMES &amp; GARDENS</th>
<th>PORT OF CALL CRUISE SHIPS</th>
<th>EMBARK/ DEBARK CHARLESTON CRUISE SHIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Charleston, Department of Hospitality &amp; Tourism Management</td>
<td>TOTAL PARTICIPANTS</td>
<td>4,156</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>94,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Crotts and Frank Hefner, An Estimate of the Economic Contributions of the SC State Ports Authority’s 2010 Cruise Ship Activity to the Region’s Economy, Feb. 1, 2010.</td>
<td>TOTAL SPENDING PER PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>$600.76</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
<td>$53.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCOMMODATIONS</td>
<td>$284.11</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$12.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOOD &amp; BEVERAGE</td>
<td>$167.46</td>
<td>$2.28</td>
<td>$16.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHOPPING</td>
<td>$112.40</td>
<td>$15.30</td>
<td>$18.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>$36.79</td>
<td>$0.34</td>
<td>$3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATTRACTIONS</td>
<td>$114.49</td>
<td>$7.74</td>
<td>$1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$3.09</td>
<td>$1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIRECT SPENDING IMPACT</td>
<td>$2,496,938.00</td>
<td>$490,789.00</td>
<td>$5,061,707.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"It's no wonder you see them everywhere."

Since putting up our first sign just ten years ago, Carriage Properties has gone from zero to more than $1.2 Billion in sales. With our average sale around $1 Million, our success comes from a team of agents with unmatched experience, professionalism and determination. But it’s the success of our clients that counts most of all. We do whatever it takes to find whatever they’re looking for.

Follow the signs - and put the best to work for you.