Agenda Item #6

134 Columbus Street - - TMS # 460-08-02-006

Request final approval for demolition of existing structures.

Agenda Item #6 (134 Columbus Street)

Applicant’s Presentation
FULL DEMOLITION REQUEST

134 COLUMBUS STREET

MAY 2022
Full Demolition Request

We are requesting permission for the full demolition of the structures located at 134 Columbus Street. After reviewing the historic and engineering reports, we have concluded that the structure has undergone significant changes and any worthy elements no longer exist, therefore preservation is not warranted.

Section 54-320: Purpose of Creating Districts

There exist several other notable examples of the original architect’s work. As provided as a guide to the BAR by City Council, this building was not included in the inventory of buildings that should be preserved despite existing in its current state when the City Council approved the revised Ordinance in 2017.

This presentation will provide six points with supporting documents for our conclusion that demolition is supported by the guidance criteria provided in An Ordinance Part 6-2017-184 Section 54-240, including:

1. Historic Features
2. Architectural Features
3. Aesthetic Features
4. Nature & Character of Surrounding Area
5. Historic or Cultural Importance of Use
6. Importance to the City
Full Demolition Request

Documentation of the existing buildings included:

- Britt, Peters and Associates conducted a Tier 1 structural code analysis of the building which concluded that there are several deficiencies within the building that would need to be addressed for the building to meet current code. This document is attached to the application as **Exhibit A**.

- Brittany V. Lavelle Tulla, architectural historian of BVL Historic Preservation Research, completed a thorough historic research study of the property. This document is attached to this application as **Exhibit B**.

- Full scan of interior and exterior of the building to document the existing conditions with imagery and a point cloud file.

- Meetings with city staff and historic groups to review the information collected and present findings.
01. HISTORIC FEATURES
Why We Create Districts

“It is deemed essential by the city council that the qualities relating to the history of the city and a harmonious outward appearance of structures which preserve property values and attract tourist and residents alike be preserved.”

Section 54-320: Purpose of Creating Districts

“...some of these qualities being the continued existence and preservation of historic areas and structures; continued construction of structures in the historic styles and a general harmony as to style, form, color, proportion, texture and material between structures of historic design and those of more modern design.

These purposes are advanced through the preservation and protection of old historic or architecturally worthy structures and quaint neighborhoods which impart a distinct aspect to the city and which serve as visible reminders of the historical and cultural heritage of the city, the state, and the nation.”

“I personally do not think that any of these buildings need to be saved and that the site should be allowed to evolve with the current needs for the location.”

-Dennis Donahue
(Former partner at Simons, Mitchell, Small & Donahue)
Defining a Historic Property

To be considered historic, a property should have three essential attributes: Age, Integrity, and Significance.

**Age:** The property must be at least 50 years old.  
A portion of the building meets this criteria.

**Integrity:** The property must be relatively unchanged. 
Based on the criteria set forth by the National Register of Historic Places, 134 Columbus does not retain the high level of mid-century architectural integrity and cultural significance needed to be individually eligible.

**Significance:** The property must hold significance to the area. 
The building is a large-scale industrial project that wiped clean a finer grained neighborhood.

Ref: GA DNR Historic Preservation Division.
1914
Evening Post relocates from 19 Broad to 134 Meeting Street

1902
Site was cleared post 1902, converting the original urban fabric to the industrial scale present today

1950
The original building was completed at 134 Columbus Street

1950
Original 1950 building is completely enveloped within the 1965 alterations. Entrance is relocated closer to King Street.

1965
1965

1979
A second loading dock is added to the property.

1979

1989
A warehouse section is added to the rear of the structure along Line Street.

1989

1982
The building undergoes significant interior renovations with historic flooring removed.

1982

2021
Post and Courier Vacates Property

2022
Proposed Demolition

Ref: BLV Historic Preservation Research, pages 4-5.
02. ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES
Determining What Should be Preserved

An official public inventory was conducted in 1972-73, outlining properties on the Charleston peninsula worthy of preservation. 134 Columbus was not referenced in the original document, nor in the additions or revisions.

Section 54-235: Guidance for Preservation

"In order to identify structures within peninsula Charleston which should be preserved, maintained and protected in the public interest and to provide guidance for the Board of Architectural Review there hereby is adopted as an official public document the inventory map entitled "Historic Architecture Inventory, 1972-73, Peninsula City, Charleston, S.C." prepared for the city by Carl Feiss, FAIA, AIP, City Planning and Architectural Associates, and Russell Wright, AIP, consisting of peninsula Charleston south of Highway 17, and additional sheets being dated September 4, 1973, with revisions September 11, 1973, October 16, 1973, November 14, 1973, February 20, 1974 and March 27, 1974, as amended by the inventory map entitled "South Carolina Inventory of Historic Places Survey Report, City of Charleston, S.C." prepared for the city by Geier Brown Renfrow Architects and dated August 1985, and as amended by the inventory entitled "A Historic Architectural Resources Survey of the Upper Peninsula, Charleston, South Carolina" prepared by Brockington and Associates, dated 2004 consisting of the peninsula Charleston north of Line Street and south of Mount Pleasant Street."
A Safety Hazard for Workers, the Community

“134 Columbus Street, comprised of multiple structures constructed in different years between the 1950s -1990s, does not comply with current seismic Life Safety Performance Level requirements based on the Tier 1 findings. This is significant as the occupants could be at risk of seismic hazards, damage to the building and other life safety concerns even during a low level seismic event.”
-Quote From Britt, Peters and Associates Structural Report

Assessing the Inadequate Building Foundation:

Based on the review of available drawings for the 1950s and 1960s buildings, the structures are supported on pile caps over piles, however the pile caps lack top reinforcing in some instances, and details do not indicate a physical attachment between the piles to the pile cap. In the event of uplift, forces would not be transferred from the pile cap to the piles adequately. Further assessment would need to be performed to fully determine the extent of this inadequacy. The foundations for the 1970s and 1990s structures are assumed to be pile caps on piles as well, however no drawings were reviewed and the foundations were not exposed for a visual assessment.

Repair Action: Existing deep foundations are often impractical and expensive to complete. Alternatively, if deemed required based on further assessment, solutions utilizing new foundations would likely be more feasible and cost-conscious. These new foundations would be associated with new lateral framing elements to reduce the lateral loads to the existing structure and would be needed to handle the overturning/uplift forces.
### 1965 Facade Attachment to 1950 Building

Based on the review of available drawings for the 1950s and 1960s buildings, the facades are attached together by a method of **strap anchors** that are cut into and grouted to the existing multi-wythe masonry veneer. This fastener type occurs **every 4’-0” on center in the vertical and horizontal dimension**. A 2'-0" tall concrete lug was installed at the perimeter floor line of the second level, interrupting this section of the facade around the entire building and a lug was also installed at the grade line. The **new wall appears to have been grouted to the existing brick veneer wall**.

### 1965 Storefront Window Attachment

New vertically oriented storefront windows were installed at new locations as indicated in the details here. **The new windows do not align with the previous window pattern**. Where the storefront is in conflict with the floor or ceiling, insulated spandrelite panels were utilized to obscure those conditions. **Other window locations were abandoned in place and infilled**.
Significant Deficiencies

“Extensive, expensive, and significant structural improvements would be needed to safely occupy the building.”
-Quote From Britt, Peters and Associates Structural Report

**Condition:** Britt, Peters and Associates Consulting Engineers (Mount Pleasant, SC) prepared a structural evaluation of the building, noting several significant deficiencies with the existing structural systems:

- The extent of repairs and structural strengthening necessary for this building will require extensive modification, demolition and reinforcement of nearly all structural elements.
- Substantial risk that the repair work required could result in additional damage to the existing building to complete the repairs.
- These repairs would likely be cost prohibitive relative to demolition of the building.
- In any case involving the demolition or partial demolition or removal of a structure, before granting approval or requiring a postponement, the Board of Architectural Review may call on the chief building official to provide it with a report on the state of repair and structural stability of the structure under consideration.
Assessing the Beams & Columns:

The 1950s and 1960s concrete frame structures do not demonstrate a complete well-defined load path as it relates to the brick walls proud of the internal concrete frame. A major concern is the unreinforced, multi-wythe brick walls proud of the internal concrete frame structure do not appear to be directly attached to the concrete frame structure either at the diaphragm levels or braced back in some manner to the diaphragm levels. The lack of these connections or and out of plane bracing can lead to a failure of transferring the inertial forces to the diaphragm and then the lateral system down to foundations. Additionally, the masonry is assumed to be unreinforced and may be susceptible to failure due to out of plane inertial forces. This is a major concern for the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s portion of the building. The 1990s portion lacks brick walls but does have masonry (cmu) infill walls with unknown reinforcing and connections to the concrete frame structure. This is of concern but less so than the older brick walls.

Repair Action:

Where present, the unreinforced multi-wythe brick walls proud of the internal concrete frame would need to be tied to a new back-up wall system that is connected directly to the diaphragms (top and bottom). This new back-up wall system (6"-8" thick) will also provide out of plane bracing for the full height of the wall. The new back-up wall system would be constructed of reinforced shotcrete (or possibly metal stud) that would allow for the transfer of shear and inertial and other out plane forces to the diaphragms at each level. This corrective action will likely trigger upgraded building code requirements and be rather extensive in scope. It would also have to be performed in conjunction with strengthening of the existing concrete frames or addition of internal shear walls or braced frames.
03. AESTHETIC FEATURES
avoided “the display of any stylistic mannerisms” and “relied on orderliness and utility” with “organic integrity” and a “complete adaption to its purpose.”

-Albert Simons Quote
Considering the Building’s Aesthetic

Applying the National Register of Historic Places criteria, the building may not retain the high level of mid-century architectural integrity and cultural significance needed to be individually eligible.

A History of Significant Renovations:

While the c. 1965 façade and primary lobbies remain intact, most of the interior has been significantly renovated throughout the late-twentieth century.

Alterations to the building include the dismantling of the c. 1951-1952 floor plan in 1965 and the removal of finishes, the removal of 1965 interior finishes, such as birch ply-wood wainscoting, aluminum storefronts and asbestos-tile flooring, large-scale floor plan changes in the 1980s and 1990s, and ware-house additions to the west and rear (north) elevations.

Architect Albert Simons called the plant a “costly building, not because of waste extravagance...but in its size, the performance of construction and the completeness of the mechanical conveniences.” Regarding design, the firm avoided “the display of any stylistic mannerisms” and “relied on orderliness and utility” with “organic integrity” and a “complete adaption to its purpose.”
Recognizing More Notable Displays of Historic Architecture:

Examples of notable mid-century designs with high overall historic integrity by Simons:

- The Dewberry (formerly Mendel Rivers Federal Building) - 334 Meeting Street
- Colbert Education Center & Library - 171 Ashley Avenue
- College of Charleston Maybank Hall - 169 Calhoun Street

Examples of mid-century designs by Simons:

- Cathedral School & Parish Hall - 118 Broad Street
- County Office Building - 101 Meeting Street
- College of Charleston Craig Hall Dormitory - 35 St. Philip Street
- Salvation Army Headquarters - 88 Simmons Street

Examples of designs by Simons that appear on the National Register of Historic Places:

- Dock Street Theater - 135 Church Street
- Fireproof Building (National Historic Landmark) - 100 Meeting Street
- College of Charleston Randolph Hall (National Historic Landmark) - 66 George Street
- Robert Mills Manor - 83 Beaufain Street
GROUND FLOOR PLAN - CURRENT

AESTHETIC FEATURES
SOUTH ELEVATION - 1950

SOUTH ELEVATION - 1965
+/-96% of previous facade concealed
EAST ELEVATION - 1950

EAST ELEVATION - 1965

+/-55% of previous facade concealed
04. NATURE & CHARACTER OF SURROUNDING AREA
The Building’s Presence in Our Community

Applying the Ordinance as a standard for preservation, 134 Columbus does not attract tourists or residents because of its history or being an architecturally worthy structure. The predecessor buildings on this site were quaint, this structure completely removed them. It shouldn’t stand as a memory to that, since this district is renewing in a positive way. To leave the unoccupied building standing would be a liability to the community, as it will be challenging to maintain the security of an empty

Section 54-230

“These purposes are advanced through the preservation and protection of old historic or architecturally worthy structures and quaint neighborhoods which impart a distinct aspect to the city and which serve as visible reminders of the historical and cultural heritage of the city, the state, and the nation.”

NATURE & CHARACTER OF SURROUNDING AREA
Site Location Relative to the Charleston City Plan

NATURE & CHARACTER OF SURROUNDING AREA

City Centers consist of the most dense and mixed-use portions of the city. The tallest buildings would occur here along with the most buildings of regional significance. Blocks may be smaller, streets have steady street tree planting, and buildings are set close to wide sidewalks. These areas occur on the highest ground elevations in the city allowing for best opportunities for new or infill development. Densities range from 10 dwelling units per acre and up. Development in City Centers is dependent on the surrounding context. Examples: The Central Business District of Charleston (portions of King, Calhoun, Meeting and East Bay Streets) and Daniel Island Town Center.
05. HISTORIC OR CULTURAL IMPORTANCE OF USE
Recognizing the History of Charleston News

*The Post and Courier* is the oldest daily newspaper in South Carolina. It traces its ancestry to three newspapers: *The Charleston Courier*, founded in 1803; *The Charleston Daily News* founded 1865; and *The Evening Post* founded in 1894.

**Understanding Newspaper Operations**

The Post and Courier has been located at 134 Columbus Street since the 1950s when the Owners spent millions of dollars on a new plant, and millions more expanding it. In 1991, it merged with the News and Courier and became The Post and Courier.

Presently being relocated to North Charleston, the plant is still operational, though the task of preparing the newspaper content occurs daily at a different location - visible by the public.

In July 2021, The Post and Courier announced a relocation of its offices to 148 Williman Street. The manufacturing operations will relocate to Leeds Avenue in late summer of 2022. The printing and publishing of The Post and Courier will continue at these two locations, and the building located at 134 Columbus Street will be unoccupied and closed.
Recognizing More Accurate Historical & Cultural Representations:

19 Broad is an example of a building worthy of representing The Post and Courier's History. 19 Broad also represents the newspaper's history, serving as the headquarters during the Postbellum period. Missing storefront windows and a cornice that toppled after the 1886 earthquake, the building maintains the architectural integrity needed to convey the newspaper's lasting legacy within the city of Charleston.

The former News and Courier Building is also listed as a Historic Building.

The building at 134 Columbus does not represent the best historic or cultural importance of the newspaper industry.
06. IMPORTANCE TO THE CITY
Assessing the Impact on the City of Charleston

The demolition of the building will provide the City of Charleston with the opportunity to revitalize the site and add public interest back to this area of the city. Having an unoccupied building in a prime growth corridor for the City is not optimal.

Section 54-240: BAR Powers & Duties

"The Board of Architectural Review may refuse a permit or Certificate of Appropriateness for the erection, reconstruction, alteration, demolition, partial demolition, or removal of any structure within the Old and Historic District, which in the opinion of the Board of Architectural Review, would be detrimental to the interests of the Old and Historic District and against the historic character and public interest of the city."

Due to the obsolescence and safety concerns, EPI reached the decision to relocate their employees to other facilities in the Charleston area.
Conclusion

This presentation has been prepared to address all six points outlined in the BAR ordinance governing demolition in addition to the structural deficiencies to conclude that the demolition of the structure at 134 Columbus Street is justified.

Evening Post Industries has met with a variety of groups and there is consensus that the building does not have historic, architectural or aesthetic features. The existing building which has undergone significant changes to meet operational needs and does not provide a worthy example of a building with historic, architectural, aesthetic, or cultural significance.

After reviewing the historic and engineering reports, we have determined that preservation is not warranted due to the following:

1. This is an industrial building that has undergone multiple renovations in an evolving neighborhood.
2. The building was not included in the Historic Inventory.
3. Significant structural issues are present with no ongoing use of the building, meaning it will remain unoccupied.
Agenda Item #7

77 Washington Street - - TMS # 459-13-02-004

Request final approval for partial demolition and relocation.

c. 1857-1869 | Rated 4- | Garden District | Old and Historic District
Agenda Item #7 (77 Washington Street)

Applicant’s Presentation
PROJECT ARCHITECT:
SGA|NARMOUR WRIGHT DESIGN
LUDA SOBCHUK
804 MEETING ST. SUITE 103
CHARLESTON, SC 29403
843.853.4506
LSOBCHUK@SGANWDESIGN.COM

HISTORIC PRESERVATION CONSULTANT:
BUTLER PRESERVATION, LC
CHRISTINA RAE BUTLER
4 HAMPDEN CT.
CHARLESTON, SC 29403
843.469.9623
C.RAE.BUTLER@GMAIL.COM

OWNER:
GREENROOM PARTNERS
198 EAST BAY STREET
CHARLESTON, SC 29401
77 WASHINGTON STREET
RELOCATION / PARTIAL DEMOLITION

Revision Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NTS VIEW WEST BEHIND 77 WASHINGTON ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NTS VIEW EAST ACROSS WASHINGTON ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NTS WASHINGTON ST VIEW SOUTH TOWARDS CHARLOTTE ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NTS WASHINGTON ST VIEW NORTH TOWARDS CHAPEL ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
77 WASHINGTON STREET
RELOCATION / PARTIAL DEMOLITION

CURRENT EXTERIOR PHOTOS

SIDE ELEVATION (SOUTH) - AREA WITHIN DASHED BOX SHOWS LATE ADDITION TO BE DEMOLISHED

SIDE ELEVATION (SOUTH) - AREA WITHIN DASHED BOX SHOWS LATE ADDITION TO BE DEMOLISHED

FRONT ELEVATION (EAST)

SIDE ELEVATION (NORTH) - AREA WITHIN DASHED BOX SHOWS LATE ADDITION TO BE DEMOLISHED

SIDE ELEVATION (NORTH) - AREA WITHIN DASHED BOX SHOWS LATE ADDITION TO BE DEMOLISHED

REAR ELEVATION (WEST) - AREA WITHIN DASHED BOX SHOWS LATE ADDITION TO BE DEMOLISHED

NTS

NTS

NTS

NTS

NTS

NTS

NTS

NTS
According to the Preliminary History of 77 Washington Street: The Blaken/Matson House, prepared by Butler Preservation LC, "77 Washington Street is a circa 1860s vernacular Charleston single house that was home to the Matson family and other tradespeople who lived and worked in the Shipyard/Borough area. It was home to the location's first family, and in 1842, and passed to Frank Barnett by 1861, who lived there until his death in 1961. From the 1860s to 1990, it was an annex for Brooks Rooming House/Hotel, which was operated by Benjamin Break. The building unfortunately fell into a state of vacancy and deterioration from 1990 onward, and the neighboring buildings at 73/75 Washington were lost. The current owners of 77 Washington wish to relocate it to adjacent Charlotte Street in order to best preserve it. The building retains some character defining features such as its full-return cornice and three piazza supports on the upper story. These elements will be preserved when the building is relocated. The rear portion of the building that was built in the late twentieth century building is an unsympathetic addition, and therefore being proposed to be demolished at the time of relocation."

SUMMARY OF 77 WASHINGTON STREET HISTORY REPORT

**Existing Elevations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Existing East Elevation</td>
<td>3/16&quot; = 1'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Existing South Elevation</td>
<td>3/16&quot; = 1'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Existing West Elevation</td>
<td>3/16&quot; = 1'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Existing North Elevation</td>
<td>3/16&quot; = 1'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Elevations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Proposed South Elevation</td>
<td>3/16&quot; = 1'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Proposed West Elevation</td>
<td>3/16&quot; = 1'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Proposed North Elevation</td>
<td>3/16&quot; = 1'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Proposed East Elevation</td>
<td>3/16&quot; = 1'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda Item #8

518 East Bay Street - - TMS # 459-13-02-004/005/009/010/011

Request conceptual approval for new construction of multi-family mixed-use building.

New Construction | Height District 4 & 6 | Garden District (adj.) | Old and Historic District
Agenda Item #8 (518 East Bay Street)

Applicant's Presentation
518 East Bay Street
CONTEXT PHOTOS
518 East Bay Street

SITE PLAN AT EAST BAY AND CHARLOTTE STREETS

PROPOSED SITE PLAN AT EAST BAY & CHARLOTTE STREETS

EXISTING CORNER OF EAST BAY & CHARLOTTE STREETS

EXISTING VIEW AT EAST BAY / CHARLOTTE STREETS

PROPOSED VIEW AT EAST BAY / CHARLOTTE STREETS

Date: 5/16/2022
518 East Bay Street

ELEVATIONS

Date: 5/16/2022
ELEVATIONS

25

Date: 5/16/2022

518 East Bay Street
ELEVATIONS

REFER TO SHEET 22 FOR TYPICAL NOTES FOR THIS PORTION OF BUILDING

NORTH ELEVATION - FACING MOLUF'S

1/32" = 1'-0"
PROPOSED CHARLOTTE STREET ENTRY AT CORNER OF EAST BAY STREET

HISTORIC BROAD STREET

HISTORIC GASOMETER AT GAS WORKS ON CHARLOTTE STREET

PROPOSED EAST BAY STREET

COMMERCIAL CLUB BUILDING

COMMERCIAL CLUB BUILDING

518 East Bay Street

INSPIRATIONS - HISTORIC CHARLESTON PEDIMENTS & LOGGIA

Date: 5/16/2022
PROPOSED CHARLOTTE STREET ENTRY & RELOCATED 77 WASHINGTON ST

518 East Bay Street

Date: 5/16/2022
PROPOSED MATERIALS

COPPER PERGOLA ENTRY

METAL WINDOW TRIM

MESH INSERT

GLASS PANELED CURTAIN WALL & ENTRANCE SYSTEM

METAL DOOR & PANELS

518 East Bay Street
PROPOSED MATERIALS

Date: 5/16/2022