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ABSTRACT

Completed in 1967, the Septima P. Clark Parkway is a prominent thoroughfare of peninsular Charleston, South Carolina. Locally known as the Crosstown, the road is officially part of Highway 17 and was conceived in the late 1950s to connect the state highway with Interstate 26. The roadway’s route sliced through the middle of working class Charleston neighborhoods. City Council journals and minutes and South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) survey photographs reveal the character of the neighborhoods adjacent to the Crosstown. These micro-communities and their architectural fabric, disrupted by the acquisition of the right-of-way and subsequent road construction, presented a picture of architecturally diverse neighborhoods in relatively good condition.

By employing City Council documents, SCDOT photographs, and local newspaper articles, this study examines the City of Charleston’s role in the placement of the Crosstown. It also analyzes the conditions and architectural design quality of the 1960s structures and 2014 structures in the path of the roadway. This analysis serves to assess the effects of the roadway throughout time. This study finds that the physical ramifications of the Crosstown were not as pronounced as conventionally thought. Within this work, the author suggests that the Crosstown is an example of a more successful urban renewal project of the 1960s.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

In the past 50 years, many studies assessed the benefits and drawbacks of the automobile on American society through the lens of history, sociology, engineering, and other fields. Within historic preservation, there is little scholarship that looks directly at the implication of major roadways on historic fabric. These studies are important since they attempt to objectively examine the ramifications that are both visible and instinctual.

This study adds to the preservation-related research on highways by examining the Septima P. Clark Parkway in Charleston, South Carolina and the physical ramifications of the roadway to local residents and the city. Locally known as the Crosstown, the Septima P. Clark Parkway was completed in September 1967. The Crosstown runs from the Ashley River on the west and ends on the west side of Coming Street. The parkway connects with Interstate 26 approximately 3 miles from the tip of the peninsula.

Historically, the Crosstown is controversial and occupies the minds of many residents of Charleston. This oft-discussed piece of infrastructure is not always viewed in a favorable light. However, no one person has ever completed formal research and analysis of any facet of the Crosstown’s history. This thesis delves into that history by asking several important questions. Namely, what was the City of Charleston’s role in the determination of the Crosstown’s placement, and was that location the best choice considering the architectural fabric of the surrounding neighborhoods?

To effectively answer these questions, this thesis is divided into five main chapters. The first chapter introduces the Crosstown and frames the author’s motivations for this study. Chapter Two provides a brief history of highways and discusses the contemporary literature concerning town planning and the impact of highway systems. Next, Chapter Three establishes the process and groundwork of analysis or methodology of the study.
The fourth chapter outlines City Council’s decision making process in the placement of the Crosstown. An assessment and brief survey of the affected buildings, photographed by SCDOT, as well as discussion of the other proposed routes for Highway 17 comprises Chapter Five. This chapter also includes maps providing a spatial depiction of the documented structures in context of the Charleston streetscape. Chapter Six analyzes the Crosstown’s location and its success based on the Council’s involvement in the project and the conditions and architectural design quality assessments.

Charleston and the Expansion of Highway 17

Created in the first wave of highway programs in the 1920s, Highway 17 did not extend across the Charleston peninsula. It stopped at the western edge of the Ashley River and continued from the east side of the Cooper River. By 1954, Charleston City Council and the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) commenced discussions of bringing Highway 17 through downtown Charleston.

Contemporaneously with the birth of the highway system, Charleston gained recognition in the 1920s as a historic tourist destination. However, the local economy remained lethargic. The introduction of a large scale roadway posed many potential benefits for the city which several council members brought to light.¹ The future economic viability of Charleston depended upon tourists and increased industry near the city center. The discontinuity of Highway 17 did not provide tourists a clear entry way into the heart of downtown which was the city’s goal.² During the May 1, 1958 meeting, the council members wholeheartedly accepted the new Ashley River Bridge; however, the council questioned the 1958 SCDOT proposal for Highway 17.³ Despite the initial criticism, the

¹ City of Charleston Council Journals 1954-1958, City of Charleston Records Management, Charleston, SC.
² Ibid.
³ Ibid.
proposal was accepted to connect Highway 17 throughout Charleston. 10 years of work passed before the 1967 completion of one of the largest pieces of Charleston infrastructure. Since the 1920s, the federal highway and interstate systems affected municipalities across the United States and Charleston, South Carolina was one such town. When City Council approved funding for the expansion of Highway 17 to connect with Interstate 26 in the early 1960s and completed construction in 1967, Charleston officially participated in a nationwide trend of roadway expansion. In 1976, this expanded portion of road was officially named Septima P. Clark Parkway after Charlestonian and Civil Rights leader, Septima Poinsett Clark. The Crosstown is an entry point to downtown, and is a loose dividing line of economic standing, politics, and race.

Historically, the upper-peninsula, locally known as the Upper Neck, was comprised of working and lower class, immigrant, and minority citizens. By the 1950s and 1960s, the
Due to the general stagnancy of the Charleston economy during this period, the perceived need for the highway to pass through downtown Charleston can be understood. Still, it is tragic that the Crosstown passes through the heart of socially vibrant neighborhoods. In this manner, Charleston followed the examples of much larger metropolitan 1950s and 1960s cities with insensitive decisions that drastically alter the physical and social dynamics of their respective cities. In the past 10 years, the urban renewal efforts of the 1950s-1960s have been critiqued greatly. Critics cite the wasteful spending of federal, state, and local monies, the creation of new slums, and the failure to
alleviate the problems the movement originally sought to solve as the main criticisms. The Crosstown project fits within the parameters of the urban renewal mindset of the time. However, based upon extensive archival research, evidence shows that the Crosstown was not like other failed renewal projects.

The original intent of this research was to prove that Charleston officials demonstrated gross bias in the decisions that led to the placement of the Crosstown. In other cities, such as New York City or New Orleans, city planners illustrated clear and rampant prejudice in determining the locations of substantial thoroughfares. In consideration of the relative failure of urban renewal programs and noted official biases, it was probable that construction of the Crosstown was conceived from similar ideals.

The motivation of this investigation is to assess the short and long-term effects on the city by the placement of this thoroughfare. The research employs a contemporary lens that values historic fabric impacted by large-scale interventions. Historic preservation was a new scholarly discipline in the 1960s. At this time, many preservationists valued high-style architecture over vernacular forms, following the trends of architectural history at the time. As Thomas Carter and Elizabeth Collins Cromley stated in their book *Vernacular Architecture: A Guide to the Study of Ordinary Buildings and Landscapes*, scholars “generally confined themselves to the study of what were perceived to be the crowning achievements of design.” The political and social turmoil of the 1960s shifted academic thinking toward the story of the everyday man, and these narratives included studying “ordinary” buildings. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, more emphasis was placed on the study of vernacular structures and how they interact with their environment. Therefore, when surveying commenced on the Crosstown in 1963, the vernacular neighborhoods in

---

6 Ibid, 1-3.
the vicinity were not viewed with the same historic appreciation as more notable Charleston neighborhood such as South of Broad.

Current thinking understands that extensive highway projects were disruptive and destructive to architectural, cultural, and social fabric. The expansion of Highway 17 across peninsular Charleston was necessary according to the stakeholders involved in the decisions. While the construction of the Crosstown did not completely eradicate the neighborhood fabric, the local residents deserved greater consideration.
The automobile is a piece of technology that embodies the individuality and technology-centered nature of post-World War II America. As the United States gained a reputation for industrialization and technological advances, it was perceived as a place for mankind to express individuality and to follow any dream. While creativity is critical to progressiveness in communities, there are drawbacks to the rapid post-war development experienced in the United States. One example is the invention of the automobile and the necessary infrastructure needed for the vehicles.

The twentieth-century was the age of the automobile. From its invention in 1904 to its widespread adoption by consumers in the 1920s, the automobile inspired greater mobility in an increasingly itinerant society. Though the affordability of cars allowed Americans enhanced personal movement, the state-of-the-art invention also influenced changes to the American landscape dramatically. The once vast, pastoral countryside slowly became an expansive network of roads with the goal of connecting all corners of America. As the automobile gained popularity, politicians recognized the need to expand roadways throughout the United States.

Highways found their place on the American landscape as early as the seventeenth-century.1 National roadways were established before the American Revolution. As early as 1803 and throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries, the federal government implemented various aid programs with varying degrees of success.2

Federal funding shaped routes across the United State after World War I. The automobile enabled more travel and more money became available for the development of

---

roads. As the automobile crept into everyday life, politicians and planners recognized the necessity of unified motorways. This vision was actualized by the creation of the Federal Highway System in 1926. The federal government implemented the early roads though state and local administrations maintained the finished projects.\(^3\) During the Depression, President Franklin D. Roosevelt explored other potential strategies to build highways in an attempt to create jobs for the unemployed. It was not until World War II that transportation and highway systems became a priority due to the anticipation of enemy attacks after the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941.\(^4\)

The end of World War II and the beginning of the Cold War influenced the American sentiment. Suddenly, the need for greater homeland defense and freedom of movement throughout the nation in case of emergency became a necessity. Contemporaneously, the freight industry began a slow shift from predominantly rail transportation to the increased use of trucks mandating improved American roadways. In an effort to unify a sprawling country, President Eisenhower remarked in 1955 that “the united forces of our communication and transportation systems are dynamic elements in the very name we bear - United States. Without them, we would be a mere alliance of many separate parts.”\(^5\) With this statement, President Dwight D. Eisenhower changed the face of the American landscape by authorizing the Federal Aid Highway Act in 1956. This legislation funded the construction of the Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.\(^6\) This network of highways was completed over the subsequent forty years, and succeeded in providing greater access to most regions of the country.

In addition, city planning as an occupation is a development of the past 100 years.

---

5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
documented in 1916 when the National Municipal League first published *The Practice of Local Government Planning*. Commonly known as the “Green Bible,” this book provided guidance to planners for almost one hundred years. The 1916 edition was the first planning book that acknowledged the invention of the automobile and the accommodations cities needed for them. Still edited and printed today, *The Practice of Local Government Planning* set forth a precedent that allowed greatest consideration to the automobile as opposed to other transportation systems. Historically, roadway planning peaked from the 1920s through the 1960s and continues as a facet of planning today. American politicians viewed highways as a necessity to the country, and therefore highways, parkways, and expressways were constantly built. The American people saw major roadways as an extension of the great works of infrastructure the government had constructed for the previous two hundred years.

Though most American planners were changing the American landscape in the early twentieth-century, Robert Moses was the individual who shaped the creation of parkways and expressways through towns and cities across the United States most famously. Moses’ career spanned 40 years, and he was considered a great shaper of New York City and the surrounding counties. He was a polarizing figure in urban planning due to his political and personal views that influenced policy across America and shaped the face of the largest metropolitan area in the United States. During his tenure in the city government from 1934 to 1968, Moses held twelve different positions. His philosophies were inherently racist and anti-urban. He felt that races should be separated and that the city should be controlled and thinned out. From implementation of these principles, Moses became known as the “master builder.”

Moses’ ascent to power in the 1920s and 1930s directly coincided with the rise of the automobile. By World War II, Moses controlled many aspects of city funding, notably

---

highway construction. The master builder’s idea for New York City was to have sweeping, curvilinear parkways dissecting the city and allowing fluid movement of automobiles. Driven by power, Moses created 627 miles of highways throughout New York City and its surrounding areas. These roads went through poorer neighborhoods, considered derelict, and more often than not populated by minorities. Moses’ goal was to move cars quickly across a given area with little thought to what needed to be demolished or moved to make way for the automobile. While not all cities were as ruthless, many municipalities used Moses’ ideas to restructure the American landscape through highway infrastructure.8

Norman Bel Geddes, a prolific industrial designer, envisioned the U.S. Interstate system and his beliefs were in stark contrast to Moses’. He stated in 1939 that roads were not to infringe on the city, and when they needed to enter a city, highways should take the form of avenues and boulevards. Further, Geddes asserted that there would be no roadside development if highways cut through cities unsympathetically. Boulevard-style roadways would allow cities to maintain their pedestrian-friendly qualities and driving along highways would allow an uninterrupted view of the United States’ countryside. Geddes’ suggestions were not always followed as rampant roadside development was practiced to maximize economic development. Cities did not experience drastic change until after World War II. Despite Geddes’ insight, Moses’ ideal roadways were predominant until the 1970s.9

**Contemporary Literature**

The examination of literature on the subject of highways and their effects on the historic, architectural and social fabric illustrates the deficiencies of scholarly study. Information on the history of American roadways is widespread and shows the differing

---

8 To learn about Moses’ life and effect on all forms of government, read Robert A. Caro, The Power Broker: Robert Moses and Fall of New York (New York: Vintage Books, 1974). This work exposed Moses’ obsession with power and control. It was written while Moses was still living, and ruined what was left of his good image. Caro’s tome, at over 1000 pages, has become the authority of the motives of Robert Moses, the master builder.

opinions on such systems throughout time. Highway systems are examined through two main modes: urban planning and as infrastructure. City planners are the main researchers of infrastructure in America, and one of their main tasks is to formalize the study of infrastructure. Thus, changes in the planning attitudes and concepts directly influenced the development of large scale infrastructure in the United States. A reciprocal relationship between social values and planning thought is a popular and important topic studied extensively today. As planning theory and practice progressed, the ramifications of such decisions were applied to social thought which informed several works discussed in this chapter.

Within this chapter, contemporary literature is divided into three sections. The first division explains the evolution of the automobile and describes its consequences to the built environment. Secondly, the chapter will offer a brief examination of Charleston neighborhood development, highlighting the lack of secondary information available on the area immediate to the Crosstown. The final section explores the expanding study of race and place, and provides the main, yet small, body of information in examining the social effects of the Crosstown in Charleston.

**Differing Philosophies of Roadways**

This thesis seeks to explore the literature about limiting automobile impact on real people living in cities. This literature traces its roots to the 1960s. The first major push back to the Moses model of expressways was the 1961 publication of *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* by Jane Jacobs. Prior to Jacobs, Lewis Mumford, an American historian, philosopher, and sociologist, was the main critic of sprawling cities and huge improvement programs like the interstate system. While Mumford encouraged conscientious building of all sorts, he was not as effective at instigating widespread change
of thinking. Jacobs’ book was most successful because, instead of focusing on the ways that cities did not work, she emphasized how cities DID work. Jacobs acknowledged that the automobile was a permanent part of American life, but offered solutions to minimize the downfalls of the invention.

Elsewhere, in specific consideration of highways, Jacobs described arterial routes as borders that could not be integrated properly into a city. Since they could not be removed, the ultimate goal was to inspire economic, physical, and social growth on either side of the seam. By presenting a comprehensive analysis contrary to accepted urban planning form, Jacob offered new, obtainable, and conscientious solutions to planners, politicians, and the American people. This foundational work is about basic principles that encouraged more consideration to the effects of modern technologies on the physical and social fabric of cities. This thesis makes use of such ideas, but it is also different as this study examines one particular roadway in retrospect. The goal is to apply Jacobs’ ideas to the construction of the Crosstown to assess what damage occurred in the immediate neighborhoods.

Jacobs started a trend that continues to this day. While roads are an integral piece of infrastructure, they damaged several aspects of American life. Typically, this fact is illustrated through examination of urban sprawl, a condition exacerbated by rapidly mobile societies. Andres Duany, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk and Jeff Speck, authors of Suburban

---

10 Lewis Mumford wrote a multitude of books and articles in his career. Two of his works that relate to the automobile most directly are: The Urban Prospect (New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1968) and The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects (New York: Mariner Books, 1968).

11 Jacobs and Moses are the representative figureheads of the automobile debate. They were pioneers in their own rights. However, it is important to remember that they were not the entire movement. The best book to read about the Moses-Jacobs battle is Wrestling with Moses: How Jane Jacobs Took On New York’s Master Builder and Transformed the American City (New York: Random House, 2009). Written by Anthony Flint, the author does a masterful job. Another insightful book about this clash is The Battle for Gotham: New York in the Shadow of Robert Moses and Jane Jacobs (New York: Nation Books, 2010). The author, Roberta Brandes Gratz, grew up in Greenwich Village around the same time that Jacobs wrote The Death and Life of Great American Cities. Her father lost his shop in the village, and later the family house, to Moses’ urban renewal projects. Gratz asserts that New York is the great city it is today in spite of Moses, and that Jacobs’ principles should be carried out to a greater extent than they have in the past.
Nation: The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream, completed one of the most thoroughly investigated works analyzing sprawl.

Part of this analysis examined transportation in America and the ensuing problems with transportation systems. The crux of their argument rested in the idea that streets and sidewalks were no longer walkable and subsequently not livable. As people, especially affluent whites, moved to the suburbs, the life surrounding inner city streets suffered and economic and social vitality decreased. Thus, the rise of the automobile aligns with personal and physical atrophy of many areas. 12 The authors’ arguments are directly relatable to this thesis in subtle ways. The Crosstown relates to urban sprawl by its aim of meeting increased vehicular traffic. Greater and more accessible transportation was needed into downtown Charleston for resident commuters and tourists alike. In the process, the neighborhood dynamic changed.

Owen D. Gutfreund followed a similar argument in his book 20th Century Sprawl: Highways and the Reshaping of the American Landscape. This book revolves around the idea that twenty-first century problems with debt and crumbling inner cities were not merely driven by technology or culture. Rather, such issues also were propelled by multiple government subsidies and policies that reshaped the physical landscape and instigated the decline of cities. The book presents an interesting and almost unique viewpoint in that it called attention to heavy government involvement in changing the American landscape and to the ensuing problems. Ultimately this was a cry to budding urban planners to reevaluate how their decisions affect the country as a whole. 13

Gutfreund’s thoughts illustrate the government’s influence in the building of United States roads. His insights show that because roadways are government entities, a hierarchical protocol is observed. This means that the considerations of a smaller or less

12 Duany, Suburban Nation, 82-98.
vocal population are sometimes lost for the demands of the greater good. Like the goal of this thesis, more sensitivity is often necessary to ensure that the entire population is regarded.

Furthermore, Tom Lewis attributed the development of the highway system, more specifically the Interstate Highway System, to the American need to control the landscape. His book *Divided Highways: Building the Interstate Highways, Transforming American Life* criticized American consumerism for not contemplating the consequences of large highways more carefully throughout time. Lewis described how the highway systems were the “stage” on which “we see all our fantasies and fears, our social ideals and racial divisions, our middle-class aspirations and underclass realities.”14 Born out of the optimism and wealth of the 1920s by America’s elite, all classes and races felt the highway system’s effects. By the time the Interstate Highway system was completed in the early 1980s, people no longer saw massive roadways with the positivity of the 1930s-1950s. Highways became known as national tragedies.15

In his final chapter, Lewis reminded readers that “[i]nterstates were a concrete snapshot of ourselves and what we valued at a time when we fervently believed there was nothing beyond our reach.”16 This statement was indicative of the thoughts of most scholars concerning the automobile in relation to major road systems.17 Lewis’ work revealed particular patterns and constancies in the making of American roadways. He outlined the aspirations of planners while juxtaposing the aftermath of 50 years of road building. Lewis’ purpose was to call attention to the motives of early road construction and the subsequent effects on American society.

Within all the major works on the automobile and urban sprawl, no author advocated for the demolition of existing roadways. Large-scale infrastructure was necessary in the

---

14 Gutfreund, 230
15 Gutfreund, 230.
17 Lewis, 294.
modern world. However, the underlying principle of most books concerning the effects of the automobile was the promotion of greater sensitivity and awareness to the issues caused and magnified by the automobile and highways. This thesis will add to that literature by looking specifically at the physical results of one road in Charleston, South Carolina while considering the insight presented by current scholars.

The Development of Charleston and Its Upper Peninsula Neighborhoods

With the increased mobility automobiles provided to Americans, tourism became a growing industry in many places including Charleston. The introduction of the automobile aided Charleston’s recognition as a tourist destination, and in a way, affected the recordation of municipal history.

Charleston is a peninsular city. Written accounts of the development and growth of Charleston focus on the oldest neighborhoods near the original walled city. Subsequent sprawl was recorded as it moved west toward the Ashley River and north up the peninsula. Extensive written histories of Charleston, such as The Dwelling Houses of Charleston by Alice R. Huger Smith and D.E. Huger Smith and Buildings of Charleston: A Guide to the City’s Architecture by Jonathan Poston, almost exclusively stop in the suburbs just north of Calhoun Street, the northern boundary of the city until the middle of the nineteenth-century. These early outliers were Radcliffeborough, north of Calhoun Street and west of King Street, and Mazyck-Wraggsborough, north of Calhoun Street, east of King Street, and west of East Bay Street. Today, these neighborhoods are solidly within the parameters of downtown Charleston.

Cannonborough and Elliotborough were the only two neighborhoods directly affected by the Crosstown mentioned in major Charleston history texts. Both neighborhoods lay west of King Street and Cannonborough. The area was described as a low, marshy area developed by Daniel Cannon in the late eighteenth-century to connect his lumber mills. Cannonborough remained a concentration of wealthy planters’ houses for the majority of the nineteenth-century until after the Civil War. At this point, the marshlands were filled in. Soon after, the neighborhood became home to working class immigrants and African-Americans, peaking in population at the turn of the twentieth-century.

Elliotborough is mentioned in utmost brevity. Most references, including *The Dwelling Houses of Charleston* by the Huger Smiths and *The Streets of Charleston* by Milby Burton, referred to Elliottborough as the Elliott lands. This area, owned by the Elliott family since the American Revolution, is north of Radcliffeborough and north and west of Cannonborough. It was mainly pasture land until after the Civil War. At that time, Elliottborough experienced the same growth as Cannonborough, and both became thriving working class neighborhoods.
Aside from brief mentions, no substantial research has been published on these two neighborhoods through which the Crosstown passed. The history of the northern area of the city is equally important to the history of Charleston. Given Charleston’s importance to early American history, it is not surprising that written works focus on the earlier developments in the city. The study of Cannonborough and Elliottborough history, in their importance as home to Charleston’s working and middle class, aids in the explanation of the damage created by the Crosstown in the 1960s. This void in the literature provides an opportunity to investigate one facet of the history of these two neighborhoods.

**Race and Place through the Lens of Highway Systems**

The study of race and place has been a topic for publication for the past 60 years. The climax of the Civil Rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s inspired historians, psychologists, sociologists and other scholars to examine the link between racial identity and citizen’s immediate environment. This idea that a person’s sense of place is vastly interwoven into his/her ethnicity became an avenue for the exploration of diverse themes including economics, education, and health. Since the turn of the twenty-first century, a new and small sub-topic concerning race and place has emerged, termed “race, place, and cultural geography.” Cultural geography focuses on shifts in identity related to physical location. Namely, this is a study of the interconnectedness of people to their surroundings.
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and how their surroundings influence the generations. The bulk of analysis mentions highways in light of shifts in public or affordable housing.

A major example of this focus is the collaborative article entitled “The New Racial Meanings of Housing in America.” Written in 2012, this article called attention to the distinct separation of housing in the United States, and how arterial roadways were used as boundaries to keep minorities, especially African-Americans, apart from Caucasians. This exposure educates the public, and creates further areas of research and analysis. One such area that warrants more study is race and place within historic preservation.

The foremost author who addressed race and place within historic preservation is Ned Kaufman. His book Place, Race, and Story: Essays on the Past and Future of Historic Preservation is one of the few compilations that studies the need for the historic preservation community to assess its reactions to racial ramifications. Kaufman’s Prologue introduces how place, race, and story are changing the face of historic preservation. He asserts that these interconnected issues are not new to historic preservation, rather they are unresolved. The book is outlined in four parts. The first section outlines the basic concepts surrounding place, race, story, and historic preservation. The second segment describes how historians “learned to study buildings in place, and simultaneously, to remove them from places.” The third chapter provides a case study of the issues, using New York City as an

example. Finally, the fourth section returns to the principles expressed in the first section and provides recommendations for the future.23

Kaufman’s book offers ideas directly relatable to this thesis, and influenced the inspiration for this project. The Crosstown is an aspect of Charleston history that is not readily understood. There is a narrative surrounding the people affected by the Crosstown. Neighborhoods were bisected, greater vehicular traffic came into the area, and flooding often occurred due to the ground level in the area. People were forced from their homes, though they were compensated from SCDOT for their homes. This study does not delve into that story line, but it does provide a starting point for continued research into the social history surrounding the Crosstown.

Michael E. Crutcher, Jr., associate professor of geography at the University of Kentucky, was one of the first people to examine race and place through the light of roadways. His book, *Treme: Race and Place in a New Orleans Neighborhood*, examined how Interstate 10 changed spatial qualities in New Orleans, and almost killed the vibrant neighborhood Treme. His particular area of focus, cultural geography, nonetheless ties into the story of municipalities across America. Of particular interest to this study is how an arterial highway through a predominantly African-American neighborhood negatively influenced the surroundings and inhabitants.

Crutcher’s study area included Interstate 10 and its path that ripped through Treme, an essential cultural center of African American culture in New Orleans. Interstate 10 was a direct product of Robert Moses and his planning style. Crutcher examines how the elevated roadway, incredibly close to the center of the city, killed Treme by splitting the neighborhood into two pieces.24

---
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While Crutcher examined a variety of resources to develop the sense of place in Treme, the effects of Interstate 10 and its relationship to the area’s inhabitant are imperative to this study. Crutcher explained how race defined Treme as a place. A variety of factors contributed to its decline. However the addition of the elevated highway was the main cause of deterioration both physically and socially in Treme. Crutcher outlined how the neighborhood was already in decline, and Interstate 10 compounded Treme’s issues causing further decay in many aspects of life. Treme of New Orleans is remarkably similar to the Crosstown area of Charleston. Both were neighborhoods that had seen previous and modest glory. Both African American communities were visible scarred by a major highway system. The importance of Crutcher’s work lies in the fact that it calls attention to the issue of race and place through a lens other than psychology or sociology. Treme’s grounding in cultural geography and history makes it applicable to historic preservation since the latter concentration includes aspects of the former concentrations.

While the literature on the topic of race and place combined with highways is scarce, the study of race and place is crucial within this body of work. The Crosstown bisected several understudied African American neighborhoods in Charleston. As Crutcher established in his book, there are many factors and consequences to be assessed when determining a locality’s sense of place. By studying the specific histories of the neighborhoods surrounding the Crosstown, a sense of their identities’ can be determined, and subsequently the impact of the roadway on the surrounding urban form can be assessed and analyzed. Modern society has the benefit of hindsight and a paradigm shift has

25 Crutcher, 55-62.
occurred since the Crosstown was constructed. Where the interstates and highways of the mid-twentieth-century were constructed from the viewpoint of traffic engineers, the modern thinking focuses on sensitivity to the historic, physical, racial, and social dynamic of areas significantly affected by infrastructure.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

This methodology aims to answer this thesis’ primary research question: what factors influenced the placement of the Crosstown and how did City Council’s decision affect the physical fabric of the surrounding neighborhoods? To answer this question fully, the argument is divided into two main sections. The first portion examines the City Council’s decision while the second addresses the physical changes caused by the highway construction.

Determining Factors of the Expansion of Highway 17

The analysis of Charleston City Council’s 1958 decision to collaborate with the SCDOT to connect Highway 17 with Interstate 26 is studied primarily through archival research. City Council journals and meeting minutes from City of Charleston Records Management establish the base of information. These records lend insight into city politics and process of the time. The construction of Highway 17 was not the only item of concern to the city of Charleston. Therefore, the journals of the events allow a greater understanding of the political climate by outlining the different facets of city business at that time. This component of the research informs deductions about the rationale for the placement of the Crosstown.

*News and Courier* and *Evening Post* newspaper articles from Charleston County Public Library and Historic Charleston Foundation are utilized to present a full picture of Charleston life and politics in the 1960s. These clippings presented information from both a citizen and a formal city perspective. The community’s perceptions are integral in providing anecdotal evidence concerning Charleston and the building of the highway.
Assessment of Conditions and Architectural Design Quality

SCDOT photographs, provided to the author courtesy of Karen Emmons and Historic Charleston Foundation, are the basis of analysis for the physical effects of the Crosstown. Historic Charleston Foundation obtained the photographs from SCDOT in the early 2010s. The collection includes approximately 2000 images of individual properties from the expansion of Highway 17 and Interstate 26. In early documentation, the phrase “cross-town route” was used to describe the stretch of highway from the Ashley River Bridge to the Cooper River Bridge. As time passed, “cross-town route” came to define the stretch of road bounded on the west by the Ashley River and on the east by Coming Street. Thus, only photographs in this area from the Ashley River to Coming Street were reviewed and analyzed in this study.

The author received over 2000 photographs from the Highway 17 project on a compact disc. The author copied the disc to an online storage facility, Dropbox, as well as two other computer desktop storage files. Once several copies were saved, the Dropbox files were renamed with the appropriate addresses and then separated according to street name. In the same manner, 2014 present day photographs were stored with backup copies, and the files were named using the same system as the historic photographs.

The initial step in the analysis of the photographs was the creation of two grading scales. The first set of criteria examined the structural conditions of each building within the study area as it existed in 1963-64 and in 2014. The scale has three different measurements: Excellent, Fair, and Poor. For each grade, the condition of the building, with a primary focus on the integrity of the roof and foundation, determines the grade. Though multiple pictures were taken of each property, only the photograph of the primary elevation of each property was used to apply the grading scale.
• **Excellent**: A structure with no visible issues with the roof or foundation. Exterior walls are continuous and intact. Fenestration systems are in good condition. Piazzas and porches are clearly attached to the main structure. No evidence of major water damage. See Figure 3.1 below.

![Figure 3.1 - 508 Rutledge Avenue per SCDOT 1963-1964 survey.](image)

• **Fair**: The structure in Figure 3.2 is in Fair condition. The roof and foundation have minimal issues. Roof conditions can include minor wear of the cladding or little evidence of water damage. Foundations show no more than minor cracking without differential settlement. Piazzas and porches illustrate significant wear, but are firmly attached to the main structure.

![Figure 3.2 - 117 Sheppard Street per SCDOT 1963-1964 survey.](image)
- **Poor**: The structure in Figure 3.3 is in Poor condition. The roof has visible damage such as lack of continuous cladding and significant sagging. Foundations have clear issues such as crumbling corners, severe cracking, and high differential settlement. Other issues include separation of the piazza or porch from the main structure, significant gaps in the enclosure system, and evidence of severe water damage on many exterior surfaces.

![Figure 3.3 - 3 Rosemont Street per SCDOT 1963-1964 survey.](image)

The second assessment yields a grade for Architectural Design Quality (ADQ). The phrase “Architectural Design Quality” (ADQ) is used by the City of Charleston to assess a structure’s architectural contribution to its neighborhood. Within recent city documents, ADQ is classified in four categories: Exceptional, Excellent, Significant, and Contributory. For an in-depth breakdown of these classifications, see Appendix B. Architectural contributions are considered when researching neighborhood landmark designations. They place high value on original fabric and pure architectural forms. Examples of unsullied architectural forms in Charleston are the Charleston single house and Freedman’s cottages. The city’s ranking criteria is utilized in this study to formalize the methodology. While the criteria is typically used to assess high-style structures, it can be employed to grade vernacular structures.

---

The grade of *High* or *Low* considers the tangible qualities of the structures of 1963-64 and 2014 with the structural integrity ranking instead of rating conditions. ADQ examines the form of the building and its architectural features as design elements. ADQ also assumes that original layouts possess greater value and that greater ornamentation improves the structure. Placing value on the purity of the building form and ornamentation calls attention to the care invested into a structure.

- **High**: Emphases pure geometric forms as indicated in original design. Exemplifies great attention to architectural detail such as detailed columns, balustrades, and pickets. This covers the integrity of specific building styles or modes. See Figure 3.4.

- **Low**: Lacks significant architectural detailing. Structures are quite plain. Additions complicate to the original layout and massing. See Figure 3.5.

Once the grading scales were established, Ms. Emily Ford and Ms. Rebecca Quandt, Clemson/College of Charleston Masters of Science in Historic Preservation degree holders, applied the grading scales to a 10 photograph sample from 1963-64. This test process ensured that the grade definitions were clear and applicable to all subsequent photographs.
After the photographs were graded using the ranking scale by the author, the 1963 photographs were mapped using the SCDOT surveyor notations and 1951 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps. Sanborn Maps were a standard practice in the late-nineteenth- and early twentieth-centuries to categorize buildings and their materials for fire protection matters. While the 1951 Sanborn maps display some changes from the 1963-64 SCDOT photographs, the 1951 documents are the best and most reliable maps to illustrate the building stock of the sample area. These maps also provide the best background to follow the surveyor notes, and thus create the most comprehensive plan of the neighborhoods surrounding the Crosstown.

This mapping exercise builds upon the work already completed by Kevin Eberle, local Charleston attorney-at-law and professor at the Charleston School of Law. Mr. Eberle completed the mapping of 600 SCDOT photographs from the Crosstown and Interstate 26. Mr. Eberle identified the addresses of many of the photographs with clear visual clues. These observations match the locations per SCDOT surveyor notations on each photograph. Mr. Eberle created an extensive spreadsheet, outlining addresses and notes in conjunction with HCF photograph number and the SCDOT notations. This spreadsheet became the basis of the author’s work to assign grades for all of the 1963-64 properties and to create a new spreadsheet for the 2014 photographs. Mr. Eberle’s work is integral to this thesis since it informed author’s emphasis on study of primary resources and analysis of the neighborhood buildings.

The first step in generating a base-map encompassed processing the Sanborn maps for the sample areas using Adobe Photoshop, and then importing the complete document into AutoCAD. A more recent map including the Crosstown will be overlaid to determine which houses were clearly demolished as they fell within the footprint of the roadway. Subsequently, every building footprint was outlined, creating the framework for further analysis.
Unfortunately, few structures that were a part of the SCDOT survey exist in 2014. The 10 structures that remained were graded according to the conditions and ADQ grading scales. Since these houses do not complete a full-scale picture of the Crosstown today, a cross sectional approach was employed to examine the quality of the 2014 building stock. For this analysis, the author graded the structures immediately on the north and south sides of the Crosstown between Ashley Avenue and Rutledge Avenue. Using the Crosstown as a base point, the author graded the buildings within four blocks of the road. On the north side of the Crosstown, only the buildings on the north side of Line, Numan, Fishburne, and Sumter Streets were graded. Likewise, south of the Crosstown, the structures on the south side of Kennedy Court, Bogard, Spring, and Cannon streets were graded. This cross section provides a more complete picture of the 2014 building stock in the vicinity of the Crosstown.

Once all photographs were documented and mapped appropriately, the final step of analysis commenced. This entailed examining any trends in the study area as well as conveying pertinent observations based on patterns presented by the maps. In combination
with the archival research, the map offered substantial results to answer if the Crosstown was placed in the appropriate location.
CHAPTER FOUR
Charleston City Government of the late 1950s

Throughout the twentieth century, Charleston gained recognition as a heritage tourism destination. However, the local economy remained lethargic. City officials envisioned the extension of city boundaries while improving infrastructure and residents’ quality of living. The economic viability of Charleston depended upon tourists and increased industry near the city center. This notion, in turn, linked ideas of expanded roadway connectivity for bringing people into Charleston. The city expressed this need, especially concerning roadways and the future Crosstown, in their October 26, 1954 meeting.

The Honorable Mayor William McGillivray Morrison led the council in a discussion of the city’s financial plans. The dialogue centered on the approval of bonds that would enable improvement projects throughout Charleston. The mayor remarked that the city’s accomplishments of the prior 6 years, such as the extension of and building of streets, were commendable. However, the city was “confronted with the fact that we desire to enlarge and improve our community, we must put municipal facilities to the property owners.” Mayor Morrison’s statement characterized the political climate in which the idea of a Crosstown route was imagined. Charleston needed to expand and become more user-friendly for both its residents and visitors. This remark expressed the thought that infrastructure must be extended throughout the city to serve these purposes. An expressway, such as the Crosstown, would be a project that could serve the city’s needs for expansion.

Also, during this time, traffic was a major concern in the Charleston area as it was throughout the United States. In the same October 26 meeting, Mayor Morrison mentioned that he asked the State Highway Department (later SCDOT) to survey the Charleston area.

and make suggestions concerning the traffic problems. The Chief Highway Commissioner, Mr. McMillan, studied the traffic patterns. His conclusion was that the east-west traffic arteries were not sufficient and that the 1954 Ashley River Bridge must be widened or the city should construct a new bridge in the Fishburn Street area. The Highway Commissioner’s opinion of the importance of the new bridge dominated the city business for the next several years. However, the first mention of what would be the Crosstown occurred at the end of this 1954 meeting. Mayor Morrison stated that he requested that the Highway Department investigate and create a report concerning the “proposed east-west crossings of the Southern Railway tracks in the center of the city at Lee Street, and other streets.” Morrison assured the council members of McMillan’s full support of these projects and urged the members to accept the survey.²

Until 1958, very little correspondence passed through City Council about SCDOT. During Council’s May 13, 1958 meeting, Morrison addressed the council members concerning SCDOT’s desire to buy land near the Ashley River to construct a new bridge. SCDOT offered the city $206,900 for park land in the vicinity of the bridge. Also, under the Federal Aid Urban Project System, the city of Charleston would assume one-fourth of the costs associated with land acquisition. The final amount for land acquisition was $339,602 with Charleston’s portion to pay equaling $84,900. Therefore, in consideration of SCDOT’s $206,900 offer for the land, the city would effectively net $122,000.³ The construction of a new Ashley River bridge was the first step in allowing access to the Upper Peninsula for the new highway.

A new bridge across the Ashley River was the first step to make United States Highway 17 continuous across the peninsula. Since its birth, U.S. Highway 17 was considered the Coastal Highway. The highway’s southern terminal is in Punta Gorda, Florida. From there, the road makes its way up the Atlantic coast through Georgia, the

² Ibid.
³ Ibid.
Carolinas, and Virginia where it ends in Winchester, Virginia. Before the Crosstown was constructed, Highway 17 came from Savannah and ended on the west bank of the Ashley River. Travelers would then traverse Charleston streets to cross the Cooper River Bridge where Highway 17 commenced on the east bank of the Cooper River before travelling up the South Carolina coast. From the outset, SCDOT wished to use the existing Ashley River Bridge as the connection point for the neighboring community West Ashley to Downtown.

This route placed the road near the Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC), and through the upper boroughs of the peninsula. The council members wholeheartedly accepted the SCDOT proposal. Mayor Morrison urged the council to consider SCDOT’s plan, stating that “[e]ither we are going to build a city here or we aren’t…If we intend to build, then we must cooperate with other governmental agencies.” The mayor saw the new section of Highway 17 as a great advancement for the city in terms of economics, tourism, and industry. On May 14, 1958, Charleston City Council agreed to coordinate with the state government to reroute Highway 17 through downtown.

**Election of Mayor J. Palmer Gaillard and Shifts in City Government**

In 1959, the young J. Palmer Gaillard was elected Mayor of Charleston on a platform of change within the city. Gaillard had grand plans for his hometown including expanding the city boundaries for the first time in over 100 years. During his 16 year tenure as Mayor of Charleston, Gaillard oversaw the completion of several projects including Interstate 26 and the Gaillard Auditorium. Therefore, in the name of change and betterment in Charleston, the Crosstown project reached fruition.

On October 26, 1960, the *News and Courier*, one of Charleston’s main news sources,
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5 City Council Journals, 1951-1954.
published an extensive article entitled “Super Highway Route Is Outlined For City.” John H. Moye wrote about the public hearing for the impending Interstate 26 as its construction progressed from Columbia to Charleston. The article focused on the interstate moving through the city and ending near Line Street. However, two paragraphs specifically mentioned the path of the proposed Crosstown. The highway administrator stated that the route angled:

“in a southwesterly direction from the I-26 interchange, crossing King Street near Fishburne Street; Coming Street between Shepard and Fishburne; and Rutledge between Line and Nunan Streets.

It then proceeds more southerly after crossing Ashley Avenue at Line. A portion of Kennedy will be closed between Ashley and Kracke where the route crosses. The route continues across Bogard near Rosemont, then crosses President Street just north of Spring.”

This 1960 article was the one of the few that provided specific details of the Crosstown. It is interesting to note that while Moye’s article discusses more specific aspects of the Interstate project, the Crosstown was regulated to the bare details of its route. This is a recurring theme in most of the literature involving the roadway.

Despite the miniscule coverage in the paper, the most interesting city document in the early stages of the Crosstown planning appeared as part of the final meeting of 1960. On December 20, Gaillard presided over a special meeting with the city and county planning committees. The purpose of the council was to discuss the creation of a Workable Program with the upcoming highway construction and future urban renewal projects. A workable program was a comprehensive plan, usually compiled by the municipal Housing Authority,

which addressed the needs of citizens in federal project area. Workable programs were prerequisites to receiving any federal assistance in community development projects.9

While the mayor and council members focused on the development of housing projects, the gentlemen acknowledged the great displacement that would occur with the construction of Interstate 26 and Highway 17. It was imperative that a planning program was formed within the City of Charleston. Gaillard wanted the areas affected by the highways to be studied because the roadways would change the way of life for many people. He stated that “[h]omes will be eliminated and new housing accommodations will have to be found. Some streets will be eliminated, and others will be cut off or converted into dead end roads. Traffic will have to be re-routed and zoning will have to be changed.” Though construction commenced several years later, the City Council was aware of some issues presented by the expressway. The main mechanism City Council used to mitigate such issues was through the creation of the Workable Program. This document guided many facets of city business, and it was a good faith effort to aid Charleston residents.

Surveying of the Crosstown properties began in late 1963 and finished in early 1964. Surprisingly, the roadway did not appear in much of the city’s business at the time. From 1962 to 1964, much of the city’s purview included zoning, slum removal, and urban renewal. These aspects of city business are crucial to understanding the political clime in which the Crosstown was manifested. The above mentioned issues were typical in American cities in the 1960s. For Charleston, as a growing city with an emphasis on heritage tourism, said issues were seemingly integral to the well-being of the city. Buildings should be appropriately zoned and so-called slum areas should be cleaned up or removed to make way for projects that can better serve the city as a whole.10 With such projects complete, the city of Charleston would have greater allure to present and future tourists.

Zoning was a major concern for Charleston City Council in the 1960s. Under the guidance of Mayor Gaillard, Charleston expanded its city limits for the first time in over 100 years. The city limits spread north up the peninsula toward North Charleston and across the Ashley River into the neighborhood of West Ashley. Some of the zoning minutes discussed the necessity of rezoning certain areas around the Crosstown in consideration of the thoroughfare. In the regular meeting of City Council, on January 24, 1967, Alderman Vincent Sottile asked that the City Planning and Zoning Commission examine the situation created by the Crosstown and Interstate 26. Sottile stated that the opening of the Crosstown route and segments of Interstate 26 would transform the backyards of some properties into effective front yards. The city did not consider this fact when it passed new zoning ordinances. From 1967-1970, there was no other mention of Sottile’s suggestion. Overall, City Council’s goal was to ensure that the structures and their uses were appropriate for their location. Their acknowledgment of the zoning problems near the road is one way that City Council performed in good faith efforts to solve potential Crosstown issues.

In addition, the mid-1960s was the advent of slum removal and urban renewal in Charleston. On April 17, 1963, the city of Charleston held a public meeting on the new Slum Clearance Program. This agenda’s purpose was to clean up the city neighborhoods of dilapidated houses. The Slum Clearance Program corresponded with stricter code enforcement throughout the city. Due to this stringent new enforcement, many people had to move out of their houses and moved into other structures. This caused overcrowding in the more affordable sections of town.

While most council members and citizens approved slum removal, there were a few who expressed concern for the project. Mr. George Seignious III of 69 Broad Street was outspoken in his unease with slum removal. He stated that the code enforcement resulted in creating new slums namely because “they [the public] are crowding into buildings which
are being forced on the slum market.”

During the mid-1960s, the city planned an urban renewal project of the construction of the Gaillard Auditorium. The volume of correspondence concerning the Gaillard was twice that involved the Crosstown, and it caused the obliteration of an entire neighborhood. The acquisition of property for the auditorium was the main motivation to create a Workable Program. This agenda allowed for the recertification of the city to receive federal funds. Cities throughout the United States continued to view public projects as beneficial and necessary for the community. On December 21, 1964, Mr. Albert Twiggs, an consultant with Atlanta, Georgia firm of Candeub, Fleissig, Adley and Associates, presented his thoughts at the city Conference on Urban Renewal. Twiggs asserted that “it would be to Charleston’s advantage in planning a systematic enforcement to concentrate on deteriorated buildings and on those which, in some small degree, may not meet housing standards.” This statement applied to the future municipal space as well as substandard housing in Charleston.

The significance of the Gaillard Auditorium lies in the displacement of Charleston residents. The property acquisition occurred in three phases. Each time a piece of property was acquired, the city had to relocate the tenants in that particular zone. The mayor and City Council acknowledged that the displacement would cause great hardship to many residents but “the city must either carry out the program or stay out of the federal programs.” Charleston needed the money provided through federal aid programs. Thus, the disruption of a select few homeowners and renters did not seem to be a major issue especially since the city aided the displaced people in finding new accommodations.

While slum removal and urban renewal do not seem to be applicable to the Crosstown project, those aspects of city business inform the priority levels of different

14 Ibid.
projects. The higher profile slum removal and urban renewal projects in Charleston illustrate similar issues with displacement of residents experienced during the Crosstown’s construction. Examining the precedent established in the planning ideals executed in those projects, but not in the Crosstown, strong evidence is present that demonstrated said planning principles did not influence the location of the roadway.

Within this climate, the Crosstown was completed and opened for traffic on September 15, 1967. The two local papers, *News and Courier* and *Evening Post*, reported the opening of the thoroughfare with little interest. *News and Courier*’s small headline on the opening of the roadway read “Crosstown Route Opened Quietly.” The article described the details of the overall Crosstown project from the Ashley to the Cooper Rivers and how the road opened a day early. There was a decided lack of traffic on the route but “pedestrians also continued to stroll along the six-lane highway.” The accompanying picture showed local residents walking along the Crosstown with no vehicles in sight. The unobtrusive opening of the Crosstown is the epitome of its incarnation and birth. The road was intended to connect two rivers with a major interstate and the lack of fanfare with its opening illustrates how the Crosstown was not of utmost importance within the city.

**Archival Research Findings**

The construction of the Crosstown was ultimately a state matter. While the City of Charleston contributed one quarter of the overall costs of the highway, the state was the final decision maker in the manifestation of the roadway. The city acknowledged the impacts of the roadway early on and attempted to mitigate those effects. Due to the timeline of federal information regulations, very little information was garnered from SCDOT for this project. Thus, this analysis focused on the City of Charleston’s role in the decision making process. Though the city may have been a lesser player in the construction of the Crosstown, city

---

officials had responsibility to their citizens. The state built the road but the city handled any issues post construction. In this regard, the different city departments exercised due diligence to ensure that the residents of Charleston were properly treated. Considering that the Crosstown was not the forefront of importance at the time, council members addressed potential issues in the order that they deemed necessary for the public good.

Often times, highway construction occurred in areas with slum removal projects. According to archival research, the absence of a slum removal agenda in conjunction with the Crosstown illustrated several points. Decisions concerning the Crosstown’s location were not implemented with the typical racial and socio-economic-biased mindsets usually seen in highway construction of the 1950s and 1960s. The lack of such preset agendas toward race and economic standing indicated that the original assumptions in regard to the City of Charleston’s decision making process for the Crosstown were false. There were no blatant prejudices executed in the construction of the Crosstown.

As examined in the next chapter, the Crosstown cut through a reportedly run-down area of Charleston. The location of the Crosstown is generally considered to have racial overtones. However, based on other city priorities at the time, the Crosstown area was not considered a slum like the area near the Gaillard Auditorium or the East Side neighborhood. Therefore, from the evidence presented, the Crosstown was not a priority area as far as urban renewal and city cleanup was concerned. In contrast to other American cities, where flagrant racism guided city policy, Charleston’s city documents do not exhibit the same gross bias.
CHAPTER FIVE

Analysis of Historic and Modern Photographs

SCDOT survey photographs from the Highway 17/Crosstown project provided the primary content for analysis in this chapter. As outlined in Chapter Three, the author established the methodology that included grading the primary elevation of each structure from the 1960s and those 2014 structures remaining. The same grading methodology was employed to evaluate a cross section of 2014 structures within three blocks of the Crosstown. All buildings were assessed according to structural conditions and Architectural Design Quality (ADQ). These results are recorded in a comprehensive spreadsheet located in Appendix A. Analysis and conclusions from examining this data is provided here in Chapter Five. This chapter is divided into three sections. The first segment starts with overall observations of the 1960s and 2014 images. The final two portions address the patterns and trends apparent in the 1960s SCDOT photographs and the author’s 2014 photographs. These comparisons serve as an assessment tool to determine the Crosstown’s impacts on the condition and/or the ADQ of buildings on either side of the roadway today.

General Observations

A total of 176 pieces of property were surveyed in this thesis’ study area as illustrated in Figure 5.1. Of the 176 properties, 162 houses and commercial buildings are graded according to the condition of the primary façade as well as their ADQ. The remaining 14 properties consisted of outbuildings and other miscellaneous pieces of property. These parcels were not graded as they were not visible from the street and have less bearing on the perceived condition of the neighborhood. Using the ranking scale described in the methodology, 58 structures, documented in the SCDOT survey, received conditions grades of Excellent while 77 were considered Fair and 27 Poor. The low number of Poor structures shows that the overall condition of the area was above average and
not as dilapidated as anticipated from preconceived notions about the neighborhood and cursory glances at the 1960s photographs. Figure 5.1 illustrates the conditions grade for all of the 1963-1964 structures surveyed as well as provides a base map for the approximate neighborhood footprint in 1963 when surveying commenced. The base map was imported into Adobe Illustrator and then each building was filled with the appropriate color. In addition to the conditions, each structure received a grade of High or Low ADQ. 127 structures were given Low ADQ ratings and 35 received High ADQ. ADQ maps were created in the same fashion as the conditions maps.

Figure 5.1 - Map of 1963-1964 SCDOT Survey Houses. Created by the author.

**Conditions Color Legend**
- Excellent - Dark Blue
- Fair - Medium Blue
- Poor - Light Blue
The significantly Low ADQ grades suggest that the Crosstown area consisted of structures whose purposes were more practical than fanciful. The vernacular character of the buildings present little or no ornamentation and exhibit a high percentage of alteration and adaptation over time. These characteristics lead to lower ADQ, but they also question if vernacular buildings should be valued with the same standards as high-style architecture. In vernacular forms, change is a positive attribute. Therefore, the multiple additions present in the 1960s survey photographs denote true vernacular forms within the neighborhoods.

While the area contiguous to the Crosstown was mainly residential, there were numerous commercial structures within the road’s right-of-way and many were demolished for the Crosstown’s construction. “Right-of-way” is the area where the actual road bed, sidewalks, and medians are positioned. Of the 162 buildings that were surveyed by SCDOT, 16 had some clear business function. The majority of said structures were located along the Spring Street corridor. The western section of the road is close to the Medical

Figure 5.2 - Map of Charleston Peninsula with Emphasis on MUSC. City of Charleston GIS, Charleston, SC. Created by author.
University of South Carolina complex which grew throughout the 1950s and 1960s and is situated on the far southwestern edge of the Crosstown.\(^1\) The proximity of the two entities can be seen in Figure 5.2. Spring Street was the gateway into Charleston for those traveling Highway 17 from the west, and understandably commercial ventures are found in the vicinity. The commercial enterprises included a Shell gas station, Hardee’s fast food restaurant and Jones’ Cleaners, a local drying cleaning business. The Shell station and Hardee’s still exist in 2014 and represent the character of this commercial segment.

11 formal business ventures were located on Spring Street with addresses in the 180-230 blocks. Of the 11 buildings, only 2 were demolished when the Crosstown was built. The other structures were affected only by the widening of Spring Street as part of the Crosstown. Since this western portion of the roadway was a major entry point into Charleston, it is probable that the position of the Crosstown was planned with commercial considerations in mind. As with residential houses, the commercial shops depicted in the 1960s images were graded according to their conditions and ADQ. Five of these buildings received Excellent condition grades with 6 displaying Fair grades and 1 earning a Poor grade. Only 2 structures were deemed to have High ADQ. These buildings were Mitchell Elementary at 132 Sheppard and Basser’s Self-Service at 186 Spring Street. Both were given a High grade due to the architectural details present on the primary façade of the building. Overall, the commercial buildings adapted better to the Crosstown than the residential buildings. Unlike residential structures whose tenants are affected by increased noise and pollution, businesses could stay adjacent to the Crosstown without negative ramifications and with the increased benefit of heightened traffic. The high percentage of commercial structures surveyed, but not demolished, demonstrates their compatibility with change by inhabiting a smaller parcel of land in close proximity to the thoroughfare.

\(^1\)“A Brief History of MUSC,” Medical University of South Carolina, http://academicdepartments.musc.edu/musc/history.htm (accessed March 10, 2014).
The commercial trend seen in the early 1960s carried through 2014. Spring Street is still the hub of commercial activity in the immediate vicinity of the Crosstown. The commercial nature of the Crosstown’s western corridor and its proximity to the Ashley River Bridge potentially impacted the decision of where the roadway entered the city. This area is an ideal location for business owners due to the high visibility and traffic flow. Unfortunately, while the businesses benefitted from these effects of the Crosstown, the residents suffered from the hard border created by the road.

1963-1964 and 2014 Conditions Analysis

The first grading scale applied to the residential buildings affected by the Crosstown was the conditions assessment. Conditions were gauged by the level of deterioration evident in each structure using the major building systems as guiding factors. Examining the condition of the building as seen from the public right of way and focusing on the primary façade of each structure from 1963-1964 and 2014 provides certain insights. Namely, the condition of the house or commercial building reveals the level of general upkeep of the structure. Buildings that are better maintained demonstrate a sense of investment by the property owners.

This idea of investment into the buildings is important to discover the appropriateness of the Crosstown’s placement and its subsequent effects. Placing the Crosstown in an area where property owners demonstrate less care for their buildings would be a valid factor for road placement. Given the general density of Charleston, expanding Highway 17 across the peninsula presented many challenges. If the houses in the vicinity of the Crosstown were somewhat derelict, then the motive behind the placement of the roadway can be understood. Considerations for the Crosstown’s placement could be
assumed if the structures within the survey were in poor condition and the city followed typical slum removal practices of the time.

Grading the structures based on the 1960s images, the author assigned 58 structures from the early 1960s a conditions grade of Excellent. To receive this grade, structures exhibited no visible issues with the roof or foundation, exterior walls were continuous and undamaged, and the fenestration systems were in optimal condition. Also, all piazzas and porches were secured firmly to the main structure and there was no evidence of water damage. Figures 5.3 and 5.4 provide examples of Excellent structures.

Overall, Excellent houses were spread throughout the right-of-way acquisitions. Most streets had at least one structure in Excellent condition. This fact indicates that Excellent houses were very common through the SCDOT survey area. As illustrated in Figure 5.5, there were noticeably dense areas of Excellent buildings. One example is a block of Rutledge Avenue from 500-508 Rutledge as well as 501-503 Rutledge. All of these houses were in Excellent condition based on their primary facades which exhibited high level of owner investment. They were almost all freshly painted white. Throughout this block, properties were owned by different people. Unfortunately, this entire block was
demolished, providing evidence that housing conditions were not of primary importance during the planning phase of the Crosstown.

Another block of mostly Excellent buildings existed in the two blocks of Sheppard Street west of Coming Street. These buildings straddled Sheppard Street, and only one structure still exists in 2014 – Mitchell Elementary School at 132 Sheppard Street. It appears that the Crosstown was laid out to avoid the demise of this public building. Near Mitchell elementary, from 104-139 Sheppard Street, 13 buildings received an Excellent grade. Interestingly, the style of construction of these Excellent structures in this area was diverse. Despite their condition, none of these houses survive today.

Perhaps, the lack of 1963-1964 structures that survive in 2014 demonstrates that the condition of the building at the time of the SCDOT survey did not dictate the location.
of the Crosstown explicitly. Dispersed examples of buildings in Excellent condition were as readily demolished as their neighbors in Fair and Poor condition. Pockets of buildings in Excellent condition do not appear to have carried more weight against demolition. The exception to this statement is Mitchell Elementary which survived the construction of the Crosstown. Aside from its excellent condition, it is likely that factors, such as public opinion, transportation concerns, and other social thought, influenced the decision to keep Mitchell Elementary standing.

As shown in the 1960s survey images, 77 of 162 structures were graded in Fair condition. To receive the designation as Fair, a structure’s roof and foundation must have minimal issues. Roof conditions include minor wear of the cladding or minimal water damage. Likewise, the foundation exhibits no more than some cracking and nominal differential settlement. The fenestration system should be intact with windows and doors in place. The piazzas and porches presented significant wear, but were still firmly attached to the main building. Finally, cladding should be continuous, if worn. Figures 5.6 and 5.7 are examples of Fair structures.

The most common issues with buildings with a Fair grade were some differential settlement of the building and lack of exterior paint. These two factors alone exuded a sense
of general dilapidation though the houses appear structurally sound. These Fair structures were sprinkled throughout the right-of-way. Every street had several Fair condition houses. These structures are not found in distinct pockets like the houses rated Excellent. The high number and even dispersal of Fair buildings falls in line with the archival research, verifying that rental units were numerous throughout Charleston, especially the Crosstown area, further illustrating the area’s designation as a working class neighborhood. This correspondence is based on the assumption that a house owned by a landlord would not exemplify the same meticulous care that an owner occupied unit would show. In this way, the dominance of houses in Fair condition reinforces the general sentiment of City Council members in the 1960s - that the Crosstown placement would require people to relocate but that the physical evidence reasserted that the community there was either not particularly

Figure 5.8 - Map of 1963-1964 Fair Condition Structures. Created by the author.
invested in the built fabric and/or did not have the resources to maintain structures to the point of excellence.

The remaining 27 houses received a conditions grade of Poor illustrated in Figures 5.9 and 5.10. The roof has visible damage including lack of continuous cladding and significant sagging. The foundation had clearly visible problems such as crumbling corners, severe cracking, and severe differential settlement. Other issues include the separation of the piazza or porch from the main structure, significant gaps in the enclosure system, and evidence of severe water damage on many exterior surfaces. Following the mentality of blight and planning ideologies, such as urban renewal, houses exhibiting poor condition negatively impact the neighborhood. Thus, it would be consistent with many 1960s planning views to see poor condition buildings as a factor in determining the placement of the Crosstown.

Rosemont and Kracke Streets were the epicenter of the buildings in the worst condition. Half of the buildings on Rosemont Street and almost half of the buildings on Kracke Street were in the poorest states of repair. Major differential settlement and roofing issues were prominent. Often the fenestration systems were either in horrible repair or were completely lacking. Many of these condition problems are interconnected. Poor or lacking repairs leave structures vulnerable to further deterioration. The two streets housing
the poorest conditions were not main thoroughfares. They did not have the visibility of structures on Ashley Avenue or Line Street, for example. This pattern falls in line with the general observation that the houses or parts of houses were not meant to be visible by the public.
greater public, and thus, were not as well maintained as other more visible houses. With the construction of the Crosstown, these structures became visible. All 27 Poor structures were torn down as a part of the road construction.

The majority of the houses that were photographed by SCDOT as part of the right-of-way study were taken down with the construction of the Crosstown and do not exist in 2014. The remaining structures were not numerous enough to create a larger base as the 1960s images. Therefore, an alternate methodology was used to assess impact of the Crosstown in the present. These findings are discussed in the third section of this chapter.

**SCDOT Survey Properties in 2014**

Of the 176 properties recorded in the 1953-1964 SCDOT survey, 10 structures remain today. The few houses that still exist in 2014 were examined through the same lens as the 1963-1964 SCDOT pictures. Some of these structures include 197-203 Spring Street and 161 President Street. Today, all of the houses are located within several feet of the Crosstown and are in mild states of disrepair.

The houses on Spring Street that exist in 2014 and also surveyed in 1963-1964 are all in Fair condition. This condition reporting is accompanied by a significant note that there is evidence that the structures are being improved. The visible improvements are typical for this neighborhood and are indicators for the renewal occurring in the area. None of the houses that were a part of the right-of-way acquisitions in 1963-1964 exemplified a Poor conditions rating in 2014. The lack of Poor condition houses in 2014 shows that buildings have maintained or bettered their 1963-1964 grade. That observation also implies that the area near the Crosstown is improving as Charleston continues to expand. As property values across the peninsula rise and the Crosstown neighborhoods are considered safer, it is logical that homeowners would work to better the condition of their houses.
Architectural Design Quality Assessment

Architectural Design Quality (ADQ) is a term employed by the City of Charleston when determining the architectural significance of a structure.² For this study, structures were graded with High and Low ADQ. High ADQ signifies that a building is higher style architecture with an emphasis on regional forms. The building is well-proportioned with good detail. In addition, the landscape features were defined and visible. At the other end of the extreme, a Low ADQ denotes a structure that has lost its original form with multiple additions or alterations. There is minimal or no evidence of architectural detailing. With the acknowledgment of the limits of this dualistic system, all structures were graded.

162 buildings, as represented in the 1960s SCDOT survey, received an ADQ rank. A total of 35 buildings were assigned a High ADQ while 127 structures were deemed to have a Low ADQ. This is an important designation because it illustrates that a little over 20% of the SCDOT structures exemplified a high ADQ. Therefore, most of the structures did not exhibit extraordinary levels of architectural detailing though they were potentially historic at over 50 years of age. The National Register of Historic Places has specific benchmarks to determine significance. According to criterion C, a structure obtains significance if it:

“[embodies] the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.”³
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Possessing a Low ADQ can exclude a building from that dimension of significance. Thus, as a general rule, less energy is expended to save such a structure.

The 58 structures graded Excellent in conditions in 1963-1964 were split further into 20 structures with High ADQ and 38 with Low ADQ. It is interesting that a large percentage of the buildings in Excellent condition still received a Low ADQ. This fact is attributable to the recognition that the building stock is vernacular in form with multiple alterations and the lack of defining architectural characteristics. Most of the houses were decidedly plain and simple with few architectural details or defining landscape features. Another factor in the grading process was the amount of visible alterations to the physical form of the building. Some houses were clearly in Excellent condition but had been through multiple building campaigns that alluded only to the original form. In 1960s and current thinking, original fabric and architectural integrity are cornerstones for preservation attention. Buildings with many alterations are examples of compromised integrity, making them more vulnerable to more modifications and potential demolition.

As displayed in the SCDOT survey, the 77 structures that were rated in Fair condition were divided between 12 with High ADQ and 65 with Low ADQ. Fair houses were designated with a Low ADQ primarily for the high number of modifications to the original structure. The 12 houses considered to have High ADQ illustrated specific details, such as brackets and fanlights, while holding true to the original building form.

Based on the 1963-1964 images, the 27 structures graded in Poor condition were split with 3 exhibiting High ADQ and 24 revealing Low ADQ. In examining the ADQ of Excellent, Fair, and Poor buildings, it is apparent that as the condition of a structure decreases, so also does the building’s ADQ. Conversely, the possession of a High ADQ does not guarantee an Excellent conditions grade. The 3 structures with High architectural significance and Poor condition that disprove the rule were all Freedman’s cottages. These
one story structures were no larger than 500 square feet and they were built in Charleston after the American Civil War. None of the Poor houses had recognizable landscape features and there were instances where foundations crumbled completely and windows were not intact. The Poor structures gave a clear impression of poverty in the area by the readily apparent roof and foundation issues. While conditions and ADQ are two separate entities, they still relate to one another. A house in Poor condition with a Low ADQ represents a structure at the lowest end of the spectrum. The efforts to save such a structure based
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on architectural significance would not be as concentrated as a better cared for and more architecturally distinct building.

It is noteworthy that some streets were more architecturally diverse than others. Bogard Street is a primary example of this observation. 112-129 Bogard Street was a part of the Crosstown project. The approximately 3 blocks of structures on Bogard Street represented an interesting collection of architectural styles. They included the simple yet dilapidated grandeur of Dart Hall at 113 Bogard Street (seen in Figure 5.15), a humble one-story cinderblock house at 110 Bogard Street, and a traditional Charleston single house at 118½ Bogard Street. In contrast, Rosemont Street was small and rundown with its Freedman-style cottages and Charleston single houses. Therefore, while Bogard Street illustrated more variety in form, Rosemont Street presented more traditional and recognizable Charleston architectural forms.

Figure 5.15 - Dart Hall at 113 Bogard Street per SCDOT survey.
Bogard and Rosemont Streets are the most extreme of the Crosstown examples in terms of conditions and the distinct but related ADQ. However, the building stock near the roadway was clearly varied and widespread. This is notable because it demonstrates that the neighborhoods adjacent to the Crosstown were architecturally diverse. It was not an area of solely Charleston single houses or Freedman’s cottages. There were old and new structures interspersed throughout the right-of-way. Finally, the structures that still exist in 2014 all retained a Low ADQ. While most of the buildings were typical Charleston single houses, they lacked the architectural detailing and original forms that warranted a High ADQ as seen in Figures 5.16-5.18.

**Analysis of 2014 Photographs**

Due to the lack of structures existing today within the original 1963 SCDOT right-of-way, the author utilized an alternate methodology to create a more extensive test of the physical impact the Crosstown imposed on the surrounding area in 2014. This
methodology is outlined in Chapter Three. This cross-sectional analysis presents interesting observations concerning the impact of large scale roadways on the building stock around the Crosstown. Figure 5.19 locates the cross-section structures surveyed in 2014 in context of the Crosstown. This map differs from Figure 5.1 because Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps stopped production in the 1950s, and no modern equivalent of those maps exist. Therefore,

A total of 49 structures were analyzed in the 2014 study. 34 present day houses received Excellent conditions grades. Of those 34, 15 are located south of the Crosstown and 19 are located north of the Crosstown. Many of the structures are newer buildings or were recently renovated. New construction is expected to possess good structural condition. One example of a restored historic structure is 125 Spring Street. This building is several blocks south of the Crosstown and therefore, not directly threatened by the 1960s road construction. However, it lies within the boundaries of the 2014 cross-sectional analysis. 125 Spring Street was not a part of the SCDOT survey for the Crosstown. However, it was present on the Sanborn Fire Insurance Map back into the 1950s as a filling station. In 2014, the structure is the home to Mission Yoga which retained the original form of the filling station as well as the garage doors. Similar renovations are more prevalent south of the Crosstown as opposed to north of the Crosstown.

North of the Crosstown, on Sumter Street specifically, many of the houses surveyed are new construction. Understandably they do not demonstrate any major issues at this point in time. The number of Excellent structures in the vicinity of the Crosstown is encouraging as it exemplifies a great sense of owner investment that improves the overall appeal of the neighborhood. The high conditions rankings of the 2014 structures should not confused with good preservation practices as well-preserved historic construction and contextual new construction could both earn Excellent ratings.
There is a decided distinction between the structures directly adjacent to the Crosstown compared to buildings two or more blocks away from the highway. The structures that sit directly upon the Crosstown are in mostly Fair condition. They were not as derelict as one may expect. These houses had a High ADQ due to their adherence to their original form. As one moves away from the Crosstown, the rate of infill is remarkable. The available lots in the area host new construction. As new construction continues, especially if it is done well, it will aid the overall appeal of the area.
Of the 2014 properties, 6 structures south of the Crosstown and 8 north of the Crosstown received Fair conditions grades. Most of the issues demonstrated in the Fair structures were minor differential settlement and staining due to moisture problems. The small number of Fair structures is interesting. The houses on Kennedy Court that sit directly on the Crosstown were all Fair structures. All the structures illustrated minor issues though they are located approximately 30 feet from the thoroughfare. This shows that structures immediate to the Crosstown exhibit decreased condition compared to neighborhood averages.

The ADQ of the 2014 structures was significantly higher than the 1960s images. In 2014, 9 structures demonstrated High ADQ north of the Crosstown and 8 had High ADQ south of the Crosstown. The architectural detailing and the consideration to scale and mass by new construction were the main contributors to the higher ADQ rankings. New construction could maintain a High ADQ because of efforts to fit in with the surrounding historic buildings. By the same token, older structures could have a Low ADQ because if the majority of the original material was not present or numerous alterations occurred. The new infill in these neighborhoods definitely contributed to the higher ADQ grades.

A total of 31 buildings were deemed to have Low ADQ. The foremost reasoning for these grades was due to the lack of original forms or the common nature of commercial
buildings. 216 Ashley Avenue, Figure 5.22, is an example of a house with Low ADQ. The house received the designation of Low ADQ due to the multiple additions to the main house and the enclosures of some of the piazzas. Likewise, 121 Spring Street, as seen in Figure 5.23, is a brick veneer structure with Low ADQ. The non-descript commercial structure lacks significant architectural detail throughout its large mass that takes up half of the block.

Interestingly, none of the 2014 structures received a Poor conditions grade. This may be attributable to the recent revival of the area near the Crosstown. There is a higher amount of High ADQ structures in 2014. New construction’s ability to garner High ADQ marks potentially affects the rise in ADQ from 1963-1964 to 2014.

Finally, there is a higher percentage of commercial buildings within the 2014 study compared to the 1963-1964 survey. Most of the buildings are south of the Crosstown and mainly located on the Spring Street. As in the 1960s, the Spring Street corridor remains a commercial area of the city due to its easy access points. There are few commercial ventures directly on the Crosstown, most likely due to the difficulty and restraints involved with entering and exiting the road. The frequency of commercial structures in the vicinity of the Crosstown suggests that roadway affected residential buildings more than it disturbed commercial ventures.
Photographic Survey Findings

The 1963-1964 photographs and 2014 photographs created a two snapshots in time of the building stock around the Crosstown. This study provided visible evidence that showed what building stock was impacted when the Crosstown went through Charleston neighborhoods and how the Crosstown continues to affect the adjacent areas in 2014. However, these effects were not as negative as expected. The 1963-1964 photographs fell in line with the archival research concerning the decision to locate the highway. The 2014 photographs illustrated that this piece of major roadway infrastructure does not have a continued negative effect on the area surrounding it.

The majority of the structures within the right-of-way of the Crosstown were in Fair condition with Low ADQ. These houses existed throughout the study area. The pockets of excellent houses were often on main thoroughfares such as Ashley and Rutledge Avenues and Sheppard Streets. These trends remained consistent in 2014 after the construction of the Crosstown. Most of the houses in poor condition were concentrated in the middle of the Crosstown in the 1960s. Namely, these buildings were on side streets such as Rosemont, Kracke and Todd Streets.

As Jane Jacobs and Owen Gutfreund have concluded, roadways impose a host of effects on their surrounding areas, many of which are outside of the purview of this project. Examples include the hard barriers created by major thoroughfares, the alteration in social dynamics, and shifts in communities’ economic viability. Both critics of the highway system planning in the 1950s and 1960s, they argued that roadways are impenetrable boundaries. In this way, the Crosstown is similar to other major highways in the nation such as Interstate 10 in New Orleans. However, the Charleston expressway exhibited several different qualities in regard to its effect on the building fabric and general neighborhood composition. The most important and also most surprising finding is that
there is little residual impact on the building stock. This is exemplified through the grades seen in this study. While the building stock improved minimally from the mid-1960s to 2014, the general picture of both time periods is one of a variety of structures based on both conditions and ADQ. The structures are not targeted specifically by the placement of the Crosstown and are not impacted substantially.

First, the 1960s images present an architecturally diverse neighborhood with a variety of conditions. The Crosstown area exhibited several housing types and current conditions ranged from perfect condition to states of partial demolition. The median structure received a Fair conditions grade with a Low ADQ score. This statement cannot be explicitly compared to other sectors of the peninsula because of the lack of similar surveying methodology data from the 1960s. Nevertheless, it suggests that the architectural fabric in the Crosstown’s right-of-way was not highly regarded for its physical characteristics. This idea reinforces the apparent lack of debate concerning the placement of the Crosstown through the respective neighborhoods.

Secondly, the condition of the building stock improved slightly over the course of 50 years. While the methodology employed in this study did not account for every single building within a three-block radius of the Crosstown, it did create an accurate picture of the houses that exist near the Crosstown. The important finding was that the distance between a structure and the Crosstown did not matter.

Finally, none of the 2014 structures received a Poor conditions rating. While the survey encompassed only three blocks, it mirrors larger trends. The plethora of Excellent and Fair ratings with High and Low architectural significance demonstrated that some of the physical effects of the Crosstown dissipated over the course of time, if the effects ever existed. New businesses are moving into the area such as Mission Yoga at 125 Spring
Street and Octo Bachi Restaurant at 121 Spring Street. These factors are hopeful signs that the revitalization of the area continues.
CHAPTER SIX

Conclusion

This project has examined a small aspect of Charleston South Carolina’s highway history – Highway 17, locally known as the Crosstown. This study serves as a stepping stone for further research surrounding this fascinating yet understudied area of Charleston’s heritage.

Preservation entails much more than structures; rather historic preservation gives a voice and protects those places that provide a narrative to the past. The National Trust of Historic Preservation expresses this thought most concisely when they state that historic preservation:

> “enhances our sense of community and brings us closer together: saving the places where we take our children to school, buy our groceries, and stop for coffee – preserving the stories of ancient cultures found in landmarks and landscapes we visit – protecting the memories of people, places, and events honored in our national monuments.”

Historic preservation is a tool often viewed as an area that focuses on saving old buildings. These words illustrate why this study is important. This study does not uncover the story of the people who were affected by the Crosstown; it addresses a piece of Charleston history frequently perceived in a more negative light than warranted.

Recent observations concerning the Crosstown is that the highway was unnecessary and a disaster from its incarnation. As established in earlier chapters, the Crosstown was a State concern with its official status as a state highway. While the city of Charleston did
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have a voice to a degree, they were not responsible for the placement of the thoroughfare. The ultimate objective was to connect federal, state, and local monies to establish the highway system in Charleston. This goal was recognized successfully in the construction of the Crosstown.

One seemingly apparent downfall the Crosstown is that the right-of-way was seemingly too narrow. Houses that sit within 15 feet of the road today were not included in the right-of-way photos from 1963-1964. One specific example is 7 President’s Place. Today, the structure is approximately 10 feet from the Crosstown, separated from the roadway by a sidewalk and a chain link fence. Clearly, the right-of-way was narrow. However, this miniscule dimensions enabled the retention of more of the historic building fabric in the vicinity. If the right-of-way would have been larger, even by a few feet on each side, a significant number of other houses would have been demolished. From a preservation standpoint, the loss of historic architecture is never a good occurrence but in most cases, compromise is imperative. Due to the efficiency of land usage by the 1960s SCDOT planners, the building stock near the Crosstown was kept more intact than if the right-of-way was more generous.

A major issue is that the Crosstown bisected several neighborhoods. This subject is the primary force behind the discussions of the social ramifications of the Crosstown. This study did not address social effects of the thoroughfare directly. Nevertheless, certain results can be implied. Firstly, neighborhoods were split into distinct segments. Streets such as Bogard and Line were split. People who were once neighbors were separated by a major roadway. Also, many of the residents in the photographs were African-American. Considering the area’s history as an immigrant and minority neighborhood and the white flight phenomena of the 1950s and early 1960s, it is probable that most of the residents in the vicinity of the Crosstown were African-American. This idea contributes to the
negativity that the Crosstown arouses from Charleston residents especially those who assume the presence of bias and malice in the location of the thoroughfare.

There are some factors that attempt to mitigate the negative effects of the Crosstown. At every major intersection, crosswalks are in place with crossing signals and a walkable overpass is present between Coming and Rutledge Streets. These allow for pedestrians to cross the road in relatively safely. There are also significant sidewalks on either side of the Crosstown, allowing safe foot traffic. Finally, the city has initiated beautification projects for the Crosstown since before the roadway opened in 1967. The planting of trees and plants alongside the road and in the medians were and are still an attempt to make the best out of a project that was inevitable.

Some aspects of the Crosstown construction are issues for urban planners and environmentalists. As a preservationist, it is imperative to keep a clear focus on the preservation goals. Within this project, the physical effects of a roadway were the preliminary study. The physical ramifications on the architectural fabric are distinct. In the study area, approximately 150 structures were lost. Despite the demolition of the 1960s buildings, there was no lasting, negative impact on the remaining architectural stock near the Crosstown. The state of the neighborhoods in the 1960s is remarkably similar to the condition of the area in 2014. Today the streets adjacent to the Crosstown are experiencing revitalization as Charleston continues to grow each year. The similarities between the 1960s and 2014 may be attributable to the amount of time that has passed; if the neighborhood experienced an impact following the construction of the Crosstown, it has been reabsorbed. However, more research is needed to address the neighborhoods’ conditions during the interstitial years not studied in this project.

In addition, this study establishes the need for criteria for assessing the architectural design quality of vernacular buildings. As mentioned in Chapter Three, the City of
Charleston’s guidelines for ADQ were used as the basis of ADQ grading in this project because of the established precedent. The city’s requirements for ADQ are intended to determine the architectural significance of high-style buildings in context of their surroundings. Few, if any, of the structures in this study are considered high-style. Rather, the neighborhoods surrounding the Crosstown are notable vernacular structures. The valuation of high-style and vernacular architecture are different. A pertinent example is the reaction to change in high-style architecture versus vernacular architecture. With high-style structures, alterations to the original building form diminish the ADQ. This is because high-style buildings are often valued for their purer architectural contributions. Conversely, vernacular buildings are supposed to change and thus multiple additions to a vernacular structure are favorable qualities. They demonstrate the owner’s adaptability to his/her situation and they provide insight into the evolution of the building, the occupants, and the surrounding area. In this manner, the ADQ criteria used in this project fell short in assessing the design quality of the study area. With guidelines specifically for vernacular structures, the ADQ of the buildings studied here would have been more holistic and revealing of the true design quality present near the Crosstown.

The purpose of this study is two-fold. The foremost objective is to commence scholarly study of an oft-talked about but never formally studied piece of Charleston infrastructure. The Crosstown presents a host of controversy from local residents. Talking about issues is necessary, but archival research is essential to fully understand the how and why behind a situation. This study provided research pertaining to a small aspect of the roadway’s history. In doing so, the lack of long-term consequences on the architectural fabric was established. Secondly, the goal is to promote greater sensitivity to issues such as place and story. Highway history is ripe with claims – both substantiated and unsubstantiated – that roadways were often racial matters. In some cases, these
accusations are true. However, racial bias is not always readily apparent as is the case with the construction of the Crosstown. This thesis promotes greater sensitivity by city planners, historians, and average citizens toward the effects that large scale infrastructure project create. If planners employ greater understanding to the physical and social effects that projects, such as the Crosstown, emit, then the story of a place will not get lost in translation. While the Crosstown evoked and still evokes many negative reactions by Charleston residents, it is important to remember that the City of Charleston exercised due diligence and the roadway is an example of a successful urban renewal project.

---

2 Caro, *The Power Broker*. 
Appendix A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>Address per 1951 Sanborn Map</th>
<th>Owner per SCDOT card</th>
<th>Sanborn page #</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>1963 Conditions</th>
<th>1963 AI</th>
<th>2014 Conditions</th>
<th>2014 AI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 259-260</td>
<td>122 Bogard</td>
<td>Anthony E. Walker</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RF in great condition. Addition of asbestos siding.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 263-267</td>
<td>7 Rosemont</td>
<td>LaVaretta Izzard</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Minimal settlement, lack of paint, slight porch sagging.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 264-265</td>
<td>7 1/2 Rosemont</td>
<td>LaVaretta Izzard</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Roof N/A, major foundation settlement, lack of continuous siding.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 266-267</td>
<td>5 Rosemont - rear</td>
<td>Harold C. Sherman</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>RF in poor condition. Empty windows. Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 268-269</td>
<td>5 Rosemont</td>
<td>Harold C. Sherman</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Some settlement. Roof N/A, minimal porch sagging.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 270-272</td>
<td>3 Rosemont</td>
<td>Christopher Ward</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Foundation settlement, lack of cladding, porch detachment, fenestration system poor. Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 273-274</td>
<td>119 Bogard - rear</td>
<td>Rebecca S. Cooper</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cinderblock house. Fenestration system poor. No visible settlement. Roof N/A</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 275-276</td>
<td>119 Bogard</td>
<td>Rebecca S. Cooper</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>All components in excellent condition. Excellent</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 277-279</td>
<td>117 Bogard</td>
<td>Paul Mack</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Roof N/A. Foundation fairly intact. Fenestration system lacking. Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 280-281</td>
<td>115 Bogard</td>
<td>Susan D. Butler</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Display house. Definitive settlement apparent. Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 283-285</td>
<td>120 Bogard</td>
<td>James Green</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Multiple addition to freeman's cottage. Roof is in good condition. Foundation N/A</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 286-287</td>
<td>118C Bogard</td>
<td>Irvin S. Duffy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Built after Sanborn map.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 288-289</td>
<td>118/12 Bogard</td>
<td>George Weston</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Some settlement. Roof N/A.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 290-291</td>
<td>118 Bogard</td>
<td>Marion Holmes Wright</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Freedman's cottage.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 292-293</td>
<td>116 Bogard</td>
<td>Arletha Powers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Absent siding. Note curvature of wall. Foundation intact. Roof N/A</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 294-295</td>
<td>114 Bogard</td>
<td>Francis Jenkins</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Some level of ornamentation of fenestration system. RF seem intact.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 296-298</td>
<td>112 Bogard</td>
<td>Susan D. Butler</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Multiple additions. Roof N/A. Fenestration system intact.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 299-300</td>
<td>71 Kracke</td>
<td>William Henry Godfrey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RF N/A. Evidence of settlement. Cladding needed paint. Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 301-303</td>
<td>26 1/2 Kracke</td>
<td>Julie Brown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Differential settlement. Porch detached from the main structure. Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 304-308</td>
<td>81 Kracke</td>
<td>Jerry M. Devoe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RF N/A, no visible settlement issues. Fenestration system - fair.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 310-312</td>
<td>79 Kracke</td>
<td>Ell Lawrence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Roof N/A, some settlement issues. Fenestration system in fair condition</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 313-316</td>
<td>110 Bogard</td>
<td>Thomasina Elizabeth McCarley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Newer cinderblock house. RF in excellent condition. Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 317-319</td>
<td>257 Ashley</td>
<td>Daisy DeCosta Griffl</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RF - Excellent. Fenestration system intact. Excellent</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 320-322</td>
<td>259 Ashley</td>
<td>Madeline H. Laffoche</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>One-story. RF - Excellent. Fenestration system intact. Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 323-324</td>
<td>261 Ashley</td>
<td>Frank H. McGill</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Freedman's cottage. Roof N/A, minor settlement, fenestration system N/A.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 326-327</td>
<td>263 Ashley</td>
<td>Zion Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Minor settlement issues. Roof N/A. Fenestration system heavily worn.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 330-331</td>
<td>267 Ashley</td>
<td>Arthur Murrell</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RF N/A. Exterior paint needed. Difference in fenestration systems by floor. Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 332-333</td>
<td>269 Ashley</td>
<td>Paul Graham</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Freedman's Cottage. Roof N/A. Absent siding.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 337-338</td>
<td>13 Kennedy</td>
<td>Frances B. Beaton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Settlement issues. Roof N/A. Lack of continuous cladding. Broken fenestration system.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 341-344</td>
<td>6 Kennedy</td>
<td>Eugene Whitney</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Foundation N/A With clear settlement of back corner. Fenestration system - Fair</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 345-347</td>
<td>270 Ashley</td>
<td>J. Arthur Brown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Excellent overall condition. Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 348-349</td>
<td>167 Line</td>
<td>C.F. Pequette</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Exterior paint needed. Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 350-351</td>
<td>165 Line</td>
<td>Elies L. Frasier</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Foundation N/A. Overall excellent condition with no visible settlement issues. Excellent</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 352-353</td>
<td>10 Kennedy</td>
<td>Lucille Beall</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rear of 363 Line / #354. Roof N/A, some settlement issues. Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 355-357</td>
<td>161 Line</td>
<td>Christopher C. Polite</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Crumbling foundation, roof intact. Difference in fenestration systems - fair. Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 358-359</td>
<td>165A Line</td>
<td>Estelle Walker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Crumbling foundation. Multiple additions. Discontinuous roof. Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 360-361</td>
<td>163A Line</td>
<td>Ethelyn M. Parker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roof N/A. No visible settlement. Minor detachment of the porch Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 362-363</td>
<td>161A Line</td>
<td>Marie Suares</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lack of windows in structure. Roof N/A.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 365-366</td>
<td>1/2 Line</td>
<td>Frederick J. Cook</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Freedman's cottage with no visible additions. Some settlement issues. Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 367-368</td>
<td>162 Line</td>
<td>James Washington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Continuous cladding. High level of care. Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 374-375</td>
<td>158 Line</td>
<td>William A. Williams</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Corner Store. Multiple additions. Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 379-382</td>
<td>493 Rutledge</td>
<td>Ellis C. Goldberg</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Commercial Building &quot;Carl's House.&quot; Important to neighborhood stability. Fair</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 383-384</td>
<td>495 Rutledge</td>
<td>Ellis C. Goldberg</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roof N/A. Minor settlement issues. Lack of continuous cladding Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 385-386</td>
<td>497 Rutledge</td>
<td>Rebecca S. Brown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Commercial lower story, residential above. Major deferralment. Roof N/A Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 387-388</td>
<td>499 Rutledge</td>
<td>Clinton I. Young</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roof N/A. Major deferralment. Porch detachment from main structure Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Photo #</td>
<td>Address per 1951 Sanborn Map</td>
<td>Owner per SCDOT card</td>
<td>Sanborn page #</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>1963 Conditions</td>
<td>2014 Conditions</td>
<td>2014 AI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 397-400</td>
<td>508 Rutledge</td>
<td>W.C. Hayes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>RF N/A. No visible settlement. Well kept.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 401-402</td>
<td>506 Rutledge</td>
<td>Stephen B. Graham</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roof N/A. No visible settlement. Well kept.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 403-405</td>
<td>504 Rutledge</td>
<td>Florence Britton Jones</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roof N/A. No visible settlement. Well kept.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 406-407</td>
<td>502 Rutledge</td>
<td>Anna R.D. Hollings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>RF N/A. No visible settlement.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 408-409</td>
<td>500 Rutledge</td>
<td>James F. Simmons</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Overall excellent condition. Presence of asbestos/asphalt siding.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 413-416</td>
<td>3 Park (now Todd)</td>
<td>John W. Bonaparte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Crumbling foundation. Differential settlement. Detached of pizza from main structure.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 417-418</td>
<td>5 Park (now Todd)</td>
<td>Urban M. Kennedy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Already in the process of demolition.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 419-420</td>
<td>7 Park (now Todd)</td>
<td>Daniel Frasier</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lack of windows in structure. Roof N/A.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 423-424</td>
<td>10 Park (now Todd)</td>
<td>Gabriel W. Bonaparte</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Partially demolished. Major foundation issues. No apparent roof.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 425-426</td>
<td>12 Park (now Todd)</td>
<td>Buster Jones</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cracking foundation. Major staining of cladding. Fenestration system - fair.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 427-428</td>
<td>14 Park (now Todd)</td>
<td>Mable E. Brown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No visible RF issues. Only minor staining of cladding.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 429-430</td>
<td>16 Park (now Todd)</td>
<td>Wilmot J. Frasier</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No visible RF issues. Newer structure.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 431-432</td>
<td>139 Shepard</td>
<td>Joseph A. Moore</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unusual house, overall great condition, in need of paint.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 433-434</td>
<td>137 Shepard</td>
<td>Charles J. Breedt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>RF N/A, no visible settlement issues. Fenestration - fair.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 435-436</td>
<td>135 Shepard</td>
<td>William Delesline</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roof N/A, no visible settlement issues, porch attached to structure, continuous cladding.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 437-438</td>
<td>131 Shepard</td>
<td>William Delesline</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roof N/A, no visible settlement issues, porch attached to structure.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 439</td>
<td>133 1/2 Shepard</td>
<td>William Delesline</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Settlement issues, evidence of staining on cladding.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 440</td>
<td>131 1/2 Shepard</td>
<td>City of Charleston</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Either in the process of construction or demolition.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 446-447</td>
<td>127 Shepard</td>
<td>Essie W. Jenkins</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roof N/A, Minor settlement issues, evidence of heavy staining on the cladding.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 448-450</td>
<td>125 Shepard</td>
<td>Joseph A. Moore</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unusual house, overall great condition, in need of paint.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 452-453</td>
<td>130 Shepard</td>
<td>Charles J. Breedt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>RF N/A, no visible settlement issues. Fenestration - fair.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 454-455</td>
<td>128 Shepard</td>
<td>Kawarsuan, Inc.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Overall excellent condition. Only minor staining on cladding.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 456-457</td>
<td>126 Shepard</td>
<td>Nathaniel M. Johnson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roof N/A, Note porch piers not straight, minor settlement in rear.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 458-459</td>
<td>124 Shepard</td>
<td>Reynard P. Hill</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Minor settlement issues, evidence of staining on the cladding.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 460-464</td>
<td>122 Shepard</td>
<td>Archie B. Harris</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Corner store. Overall excellent condition but bowing walls warrant fair grade.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 465-466</td>
<td>123 Shepard</td>
<td>Salem Baptist Church</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>One-story structure, Roof N/A, no evidence of major staining or settlement issues.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 467-468</td>
<td>121 Shepard</td>
<td>Eline B. Werton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Either in the process of construction or demolition.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 469-471</td>
<td>119 Shepard</td>
<td>Scott M. Boyle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unusual Victorian house. Overall excellent condition, needed paint.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 475-476</td>
<td>120 Shepard</td>
<td>Jackson T. Rhodes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roof N/A, Other excellent conditions. Multiple additions.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 477-479</td>
<td>118 Shepard</td>
<td>John H. Jenkins</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roof N/A, lack of paint, minor porch sagging.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 480-481</td>
<td>116 Shepard</td>
<td>Margaret Oree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Minor settlement issues, note staining on foundation.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 483-484</td>
<td>114 Shepard</td>
<td>Lillian M. Anderson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Minor settlement issues, Roof N/A, lack of paint, and broken shutters.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 485-488</td>
<td>112 Shepard</td>
<td>Abigail O. Crum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roof N/A, No evidence of major staining or settlement issues.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 489-493</td>
<td>110 Shepard</td>
<td>Alma L. Browning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Note ornamentation and broken window, some settlement issues.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 494-495</td>
<td>108 Shepard</td>
<td>Albe Kirchenstein</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Heavy staining around parapet, some visible settlement, sagging porch.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 496-498</td>
<td>106 Shepard</td>
<td>Annie H. Powers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>RF - Excellent, Fenestration system intact - note missing gingerbread woodwork.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 499-500</td>
<td>104 Shepard</td>
<td>Rachel Bailey</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Excellent condition.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 501-504</td>
<td>285 Corning</td>
<td>Gladys S. Wilson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Freedman's cottage?? Overall excellent condition.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 505-507</td>
<td>287 Corning</td>
<td>John T. Bowden</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1/2 Spring (James Hotel) in background of #511</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 509-511</td>
<td>233 Spring</td>
<td>Sherill Oil Co.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>VA Hoop in background, 1/2 Spring (James Hotel) in background of #515</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 513-515</td>
<td>223 Spring</td>
<td>The Fork Co. Inc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Primary facade looks excellent, rear picture shows multiple issues.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 516-518</td>
<td>223 Spring</td>
<td>Sarah Chinnis Sanders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Overall excellent condition, note the multiple additions.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 520-522</td>
<td>223 Spring</td>
<td>Arco Investment Co.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minor settlement issues, note multiple additions and staining of cladding.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 523-524</td>
<td>215 Spring</td>
<td>Ruby E. Jacobs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent condition.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 525-526</td>
<td>213 Spring</td>
<td>Loretta Jackson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent condition.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 527-528</td>
<td>211 Spring</td>
<td>Freda C. Doscher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent condition.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX A - 1963-1964 GRADING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>Address per 1951 Sanborn Map</th>
<th>Owner per SCDOT card</th>
<th>Sanborn page #</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>1963 Conditions</th>
<th>1963 AI</th>
<th>2014 Conditions</th>
<th>2014 AI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 531-533 203 Spring</td>
<td>531-533</td>
<td>207 Spring</td>
<td>Olympia Pappelidow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>corner of Spring and Courtenay.</strong> Excellent overall condition. Note multiple additions</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 534-535 205 Spring</td>
<td>534-535</td>
<td>205 Spring</td>
<td>Katie Anna Meier</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Roof in excellent condition, some settlement issues, lack of paint on exterior</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 536-537 203 Spring</td>
<td>536-537</td>
<td>203 Spring</td>
<td>Samuel Riley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Overall excellent condition, note the multiple additions</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 538-539 201 Spring</td>
<td>538-539</td>
<td>201 Spring</td>
<td>Alex B. Beall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Foundation N/A, no visible settlement issues, minor wear of exterior cladding</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 540-541 199 Spring</td>
<td>540-541</td>
<td>199 Spring</td>
<td>Elias A. Johnson, Sr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Foundation N/A, significant sagging of the piazza, evidence of staining on cladding</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rte 17 542-543 197 Spring</td>
<td>542-543</td>
<td>197 Spring</td>
<td>Annie Henrietta Masche</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jones Dry Cleaners, RF in excellent condition, fenestration system intact.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Historical/Architectural Inventory Rating System

Category 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, massing, materials, textures, refined detail and craftsmanship. They are elegant and innovative, and must be preserved and retained in situ at all costs.

Category 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.

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

Category 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.
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