Greetings,

As the incoming President of the Board of Directors of the Preservation Society I was asked to write a letter of introduction to the membership. When I thought about it, this was the perfect opportunity to share some of my thoughts on the necessity of preservation. I like to think of this philosophy as “no house left behind.”

Preservation can be stewardship in a sustainable context. Historic buildings represent a major prior investment of resources and energy. This investment is like money already in the bank. Every new building, on the other hand, represents a new and additional impact on the environment.

Here in Charleston, for instance, a perfect example is the growing interest in repairing and restoring the fine Craftsman style residences in the Westside neighborhoods, Hampton Park Terrace, and the brick bungalows in Wagener Terrace. This contributes to our community’s environmental sustainability. It is not just about 18th century single houses any more.

In 1990, Charleston was the site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s 44th National Preservation Conference. One of the outcomes of that meeting was the adoption of specific goals which became known as The Charleston Principles.

One of these goals seems especially important to me as the society faces key decisions during this year and how these decisions will impact the sustainability of our city.

Item #7 of The Charleston Principles bids us to recognize the cultural diversity of our communities – to acknowledge, identify, and preserve America’s cultural and physical resources. The health of a city relies on diversity in business, dwellings, recreation, and commerce to sustain itself. In today’s parlance, it reminds us to think “green.”

Residents need a positive sense of neighborhood, a sense of place. New development must respect the existing sense of place. It should not be intrusive in height or at street level, and its design should not negatively impact the ecology of the city.

Charleston is one of the few cities in the United States that is truly walkable. New development and city planning must not discourage pedestrian traffic. Currently, neighborhood associations are working to reverse decisions made over fifty years ago which mandated one way traffic on a number of our streets. Research now shows that two-way traffic slows automobile traffic, encourages pedestrian traffic and public transport. In other words, it improves livability.

That’s sustainability. That’s being “green.”
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Some of us will recall a time when a popular folk group called The New Christy Minstrels set America’s feet tapping to a hit tune that went, “Green green; it’s green they say, on the far side of the hill. Green green; I’m goin’ away to where the grass is greener still.” Somebody else said, “What goes around comes around,” and it must be true… because everything these days is going “green” again.

This time, however, we would all hope it’s happening for the betterment of our beleaguered planet. Still, one wonders if in the rush to be timely and earth-friendly, everything “green” has to be new, has to be modern, or has to be au naturale.

Preservation Progress takes a look at what it means to be “green” in the realm of preservation and what we’re learning about the value of looking at our built environment from an ecological perspective.

Last December, Richard Moe, President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, spoke before an august group of his peers addressing the role preservation plays in fighting the war against climate change.

“When you strip away the rhetoric,” he said, “preservation is simply having the good sense to hold on to things that are well-designed, that link us with our past in a meaningful way, and that have plenty of good use left in them.”

Without identifying it as such, Mr. Moe’s remarks highlighted a glossary of new preservation terminology well-suited to today’s infatuation with all things “green.”

In its infancy, the preservation movement was primarily focused on saving and restoring “iconic buildings.” Preservationist Ann Cunningham’s famous crusade to save Mount Vernon in the 1850s is the classic example. Here in Charleston, the 1920s rescue of the (1803) Joseph Manigault House on Meeting Street leaps to mind.

By the middle of the 20th century, preservationists embraced the concept of “economic benefit” and whole downtowns throughout America were revitalized by the National Trust’s inspirational Main Street program – and others similar to it. At stake were the very architectural and historical features that give many of our cities and towns their distinctive identity, their unique “sense of place.”

Along with this trend came the recognition that preservation is a catalyst for supporting “social values” as well. Respecting “diversity” became a preservation ethic. Fostering a connection to our shared past, we found, encourages “stability, continuity,” and “liveability” in neighborhoods – large and small. In other words, the preservation movement proved to be refreshingly dynamic and remarkably adaptable to change while it continued to essentially save old buildings at risk.

Mr. Moe went on to say, “Even as (the National Trust) opened our arms to save icons of the modernism movement such as the Philip Johnson’s famous 1949 Glass House, the spirit of our effort is the intrinsic respect for history and our inseparable connection to it.” Does this example of contemporary preservation inspire us to reexamine the worth of the 1965 L. Mendel Rivers building on Meeting Street and its place in Charleston’s ongoing architectural history?

Nowadays, Mr. Moe acknowledges, the byword is “green.” Growing numbers of people worldwide are concerned with climatic change and the associated degradation of the environment. He cites statistics saying Americans consume an inordinate share of the world’s natural resources and energy (creating 22% of the world’s greenhouse gas emissions), and yet we represent only a fraction of the world’s population (5%).
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“New Buildings in Old Places”

A message from H.R.H., the Prince of Wales

Editor’s Note: When the Prince of Wales visited Charleston in 1989, he was already well-known as a critic of current architectural trends being built in England and he was often quoted on the subject in the British press. Almost three decades later, his views are still raising eyebrows and making headlines. But his authority on the subject has grown with time and his benevolent influence is respected on both sides of the Atlantic. Here, in summary, are remarks he made on January 31, 2008 in a speech to the Conference on New Buildings in Old Places at St. James’ Palace in London.

At present, our country looks to be in the midst of one of its periodic building booms, and in an ancient land such as our own, we cannot help but build the new amongst the old. I can only think of two times in our history where it was proposed to build homes, workplaces and shops on such a massive scale, and both times it changed the face of Britain. I am thinking of the Victorian era, when our predecessors built the face of the cities of industrial England, and of the post-war period through to the end of the 1960s when there was a rush to rebuild, knocking down much that was old in the process.

In the first case, although there were the inevitable mistakes made, much that was built was of enduring value and at least acknowledged the historical patterns and identity of past generations. In the second, every time-tested principle and all reference to an accumulated inheritance in the “grammar”, if you like, of architecture and building were simply thrown out of the window and we have been living with the consequences of this enormously risky experiment ever since.

The point about all this is that we simply cannot afford to repeat these mistakes, but this time in a twenty-first century guise. In fact, I would go so far as to say we must not repeat such mistakes. We owe it to the people of this country to do infinitely better and that is the purpose of today’s conference: to try to learn from the past, and take the best ideas forward as we build what will become tomorrow’s heritage today.

Much of the new housing is being built within existing built-up areas, and provided in the form of flats in residential towers of nine to twenty stories. These towers are generally opposed by local residents, but loved by “buy to let” investors and planners to add a bit of the “wow” factor to their suburb or town. I therefore hope very much that (we) will address the issue of building housing at greater densities in a way that is harmonious with town and city scapes, with the existing heritage, and with the needs and desires of local residents.

We have endured for too long the prevailing lack of courtesy within the public realm and the time has come to reinvent “good manners” in the way we build. We should surely be asking whether it is a natural pre-requisite of “being modern” to display bad manners? Is it “being modern”, for instance, to vandalize the few remaining relatively unspoilt, beautiful areas of our cities, any more than it would be “modern” to mug defenceless elderly people? Can it not be modern “to do to others as you would have them do to you?” That’s the question.

So now, taking advantage of the fact that I am nearly sixty, I would like to share a few thoughts with you about the ways that we can build new buildings in old places, distilled from nearly twenty years of all this experience.

• Firstly, recognition that sustainability actually means building for the long-term – one hundred years, rather than twenty years;

• Secondly, because of this, it is worth building in an adaptable and flexible manner, reassessing and re-using existing buildings wherever possible;

• Thirdly, it is worth building in a manner that fits the place, in terms of materials used, proportion and layouts and climate, ecology and building practices;

• Fourthly, it is worth building beautifully, in a manner that builds upon tradition, evolving it in response to...
present challenges and utilizing present day resources and techniques;

• And, finally, it is worth understanding the purpose of a building, or group of buildings, within the hierarchy of the buildings around it and responding with an appropriate building type and design. Doing this often implies the composition of a harmonious whole, rather than the erection of singular objects of architectural or corporate will which merely panders to ego-centric imperatives.

Such principles, in my experience, tend to create added social and environmental value, as well as commercial value. They apply whether building anew or adapting existing buildings. We all need to consider the meaning of heritage and recognize that sustainability is achieved by creating buildings that people will both want to use, and be able to use efficiently, a hundred years hence.

Local distinctiveness should flourish and traditional craft skills should be re-discovered and incorporated in new buildings as well as old; so that true and timeless methods of building are exploited for not only the beauty they create, but also the environmental benefits they offer.

So in those places where more ambitious urban development is appropriate, there are principles of planning which, again, can make sure new development is adding value to communities in this country. Such principles include well-designed public spaces, a mix of shops and services within walking distance, values of hierarchy, legibility and proportion, integration of high-quality private, social and affordable housing – and by incorporating these qualities we are applying the lessons tradition teaches us about how better neighbourhood design improves the lives of those who live in new developments.

And while we are talking about principles, let’s just consider for a moment, if we may, the issue of taller buildings in our historic towns and cities. In this area I very much fear we are repeating the mistakes of the 1960s, but doing so with even greater hubris and efficiency!

Corporate and residential towers are being proposed across London, and overshadowing World Heritage sites from Edinburgh to Bath. There is no point at all in having a World Heritage site unless it retains its unique integrity. There are, after all, other areas where such tall buildings could be accommodated within their own context. The French have managed it quite well up to now in La Défense, in Paris (but I hear there are even current threats to the integrity of the historic quarters of Paris from ever taller, deconstructed glass monoliths).

For some unaccountable reason we seem to be determined to vandalize these few remaining sites which retain the kind of human scale and timeless character that so attract people to them and which increase in value as time goes by. What is it about our outlook which perpetuates desire deliberately to desecrate such places? You would think, wouldn’t you, that we might have outgrown this kind of attitude by now…?

Thus, in chasing the corporate tenant or the buy-to-let investor, we may not only be destroying our heritage, but killing the goose that lays the golden egg for we will destroy what makes our cities and towns so attractive to tourists in the process.

Many people believe, erroneously, that the only way to achieve environmental efficiencies in development is by building very tall buildings. Indeed, improving the average density of building in England is critical to achieving “location efficiency,” which reduces automobile use and greenhouse gas emissions, as well as minimizing land-take. But these efficiencies only begin to occur at 17 units to the hectare (2.47 acres), when public transport becomes feasible, and begin to tail off at densities above 70 units to the hectare, according to a definitive research study from the United States.

And, if we look at London’s skyline, and compare it, say, to Paris where, up to now, building heights are regulated far more precisely, we are immediately struck by how much less is protected here than abroad. The current debates about tall buildings here in London would have been unnecessary and superfluous in Paris – where tall buildings have been concentrated, as I have mentioned earlier, in the urban quarter of La Défense – outside the historic area which, of course, continues to attract tourists and their spending power.

And, in Berlin, too, where an immense programme of reconstruction and regeneration has gone on – larger than in any other European city – the city leaders have insisted upon rigorous limitations to the height of new buildings.

These kinds of approaches can help to achieve a far more coherent sense of harmony and civic self-confidence than the alternative “free-for-all” that will leave London and our
The 2007 Carolopolis and Pro Merito Awards ceremony, held January 31st at the Charleston Place Riviera Theater, was a great success for the Preservation Society and all in attendance enjoyed the program and reception. Seven properties were recognized and their owners acknowledged for their hard work, attention to detail, and more importantly for being local stewards of historic preservation.

The Henry Gerdts House at 13 Pitt Street received a Pro Merito award for exterior preservation of the main house, dependency, and garden wall. A Pro Merito award was presented to 60 Montagu, the Gaillard-Bennett House, for exterior preservation, exterior restoration of the kitchen house, and reconstruction of the tack house. A Carolopolis was awarded to 39 Legare for exterior preservation of the main house and new construction of a garage and hyphen. Carolopolis awards for exterior rehabilitation were presented to the dependency buildings at 20 Charlotte Street, the Joseph Aiken House, the Charleston single house at 201 Rutledge Avenue, the commercial and residential building at 162 Spring Street, and the duplex turned single family residence at 3 Elmwood Avenue in Hampton Park Terrace.

The Preservation Society would like to extend its thanks to everyone who participated in the program and to the sponsors, Charleston Place Hotel and Carriage Properties, for helping make this a successful event.

The Carolopolis Award program was created in 1953 to recognize outstanding achievement in exterior preservation, restoration, rehabilitation and new construction in the City of Charleston. Since 1953, the Preservation Society has presented 1,309 awards in recognition of such achievement. The Pro Merito, or “For Merit” Award was created in 1999 to recognize those properties that have received a Carolopolis Award not less than 20 years ago and have either undergone a second major renovation or have demonstrated a high level of continuous preservation.

The Preservation Society is now accepting nominations for the 2008 Carolopolis and Pro Merito Awards. Visit our website www.preservationsociety.org for more information on the program and to download a nomination form. Nominations should be sent to the Preservation Society by August 15, 2008. Mark your calendars for the 2008 Carolopolis Awards ceremony, scheduled for Thursday, January 29, 2009 at the Charleston Place Riviera Theater.
Charleston’s reputation for innovative building construction has not always been universally celebrated in recent years. New design that incorporates green components that blend well with our city’s majestic homes and the existing Lowcountry vernacular has been limited, often meriting negative public attention reflected from unsettling and confrontational planning and zoning and BAR meetings. However, in 2008, Charleston residents are witnessing a raising of the bar – heightened standards for groundbreaking eco-friendly green design. A case in point is a project known as “One Cool Blow,” a smart growth building of modern urban design going up just below Interstate 26 on the Charleston peninsula. This example of a new green project is trying not only to please our aesthetic eye, but to also better our environment and leave a cleaner earth for future generations.

How did we get here? How did we move from a city known for its glittering architectural past to a serious example of building “green” for a better future?

It did not hurt that The National Trust for Historic Preservation launched a sustainability initiative in 2006 to look beyond preservation of existing structures towards better use of existing structures with a new attitude toward new construction. Their initiative reflected a statistic showing 48% of green house gas emission in our country is the direct result of our built environment.

Here in Charleston, we began to look at concepts like “smart growth, green construction” and “modern urban design” for answers to our burgeoning growth and environmental concerns. We learned these were more than fleeting buzz words; they were tools to take us into a better future.

On one hand, going “green” means taking a fresh look at every single building of new construction. But on the other hand, we must reevaluate our approach to all new buildings. And this does not just mean the context in which a neighborhood is seen, it entails reconsidering the context in which we select materials for new construction. From the bones of the building to the details of the landscaping we must now ask what each element offers to those living within the building and those living in the community where it is located.

We are an organization with a charge to preserve what we have, but the challenge of sustainability incorporates that charge to include more. The proof of this can be found going up in the once industrial area along the Cooper River named for the refreshing breeze that refreshed our sweltering citizenry in the bygone days before air conditioning.

Driving into the city from Mt. Pleasant, the area once known as “Cool Blow” gently catches the eye enough to warrant a second glance which poses the mental question: “What’s going on down there?”
Here is what’s going on: Cool Blow is a four story building clad in concrete, glass and copper with mixed use space below. All signs indicate this new construction will function well within its context – something most preservationists agree is a key attribute to community longevity.

As for measuring up in the “green zone,” it is impossible to deny its “greenness”. No empty promises or surface green are to be found at One Cool Blow.

Give it green points for being a multiple unit building with 785 to 1,175 square feet per unit. Cast another green vote for precast concrete walls that can sustain hurricane force winds. The precast walls are energy efficient, soundproof, and are made of recycled materials. Then there are bonus green points for using pavers that reduce storm water runoff and mitigate the heating effect. The greenest of green ideas sits on top of the buildings where a vegetated “green roof” system replaces shingles.

The accounting of green accolades continues with interior bamboo flooring, window placement to take advantage of natural lighting, and low VOC’s (volatile organic compounds) in paints, stains and sealants. All of the landscaping uses native plants that, once established, require less irrigation than non-natives.

Is this the kind of thinking that goes into being “green”?

Clearly, the answer is a resounding YES. But if we’ve learned anything about the role of sustainable architecture in the short time we’ve recognized its importance to the national and global green movement – it’s that change is the only thing that endures. Green technology is constantly improving and new ideas in building materials and design are becoming practical realities every day. In that sense, Charleston’s resplendent display of architectural diversity is intact and continues to evolve on the cutting edge. After all, this is Charleston. And if that’s not preservation at its best, who knows what is?

One Cool Blow is one of several green projects being designed in Charleston. This article is a reflection of this timely movement, curiosity of its implementation, and the Preservation Society’s determination to provide its membership with appropriate knowledge on this subject as we grow in our sensitivity for the need to be “green”.
CHARLESTON’S FEDERAL BUILDINGS:
KNOWING WHEN TO HOLD ‘EM;
KNOWING WHEN TO FOLD ‘EM.

If architectural styles were playing cards, Charleston would be holding a winning hand when it comes to Federal (in this case – meaning Federal government)) buildings. When you fan them out together, it’s almost a full house of styles reflecting the fashionable trends that have come and gone (and come back again) in American architecture.

Can you name them? Better yet, can you date them? Here’s a quick review of the Federal buildings of Charleston in the order in which they were constructed.

L. MENDEL RIVERS FEDERAL BUILDING
Meeting Street at Marion Square
Built as a seven-story office building to house the city’s expanding Federal presence, this is one of Charleston’s best examples of late 20th century architecture. Although its construction includes many fine and now-costly building materials, it has stood empty since 1999 when water damage from Hurricane Floyd exposed asbestos contamination.

Answer: Modern, (1965)
**Federal Court House and Post Office**

83 Broad Street

When the earthquake of 1886 destroyed the existing post office building at the southeast corner of Meeting and Broad, the exuberant granite structure that replaced it became something of a symbol of Charleston’s recovery from the disaster. Note the truncated tower on the northeast corner.

*Answer: Renaissance Revival (1896–97)*

---

**Hollings Judicial Center**

200 East Bay Street

This Federal building is distinctive for what it does NOT do, as much as for what it does. While its construction allowed the city’s legal center to remain in downtown Charleston, this design did not impose a major architectural change to the traditional “Four Corners of Law.” It did not overwhelm its surrounding neighbors in height, scale nor mass. And its contemporary lines harmonized with the historical neighborhood.

*Answer: Contextual Post Modern, 1987*

---

**United States Custom House**

200 East Bay Street

This is Charleston’s only Federal building constructed in this style—used widely elsewhere in the city and in Washington, D.C. Originally intended to feature a large dome and four impressive porticoes, construction of this building was interrupted and downscaled due to the Civil War.

*Answer: Classic Revival (1849–79)*
NEW PRESERVATION EASEMENTS DONATED IN 2007

Seven preservation easements were donated to The Preservation Society of Charleston in 2007. The Preservation Society has been accepting preservation easements since 1978. In addition to these seven exterior preservation easements, three of the property owners also donated interior easements on their property. The Preservation Society is proud to announce the following preservation easements donated in 2007:

18 South Adger’s Wharf

20 New Street

45 Church Street
(exterior and interior)

47 Church Street
(exterior and interior)

9 Orange Street
(exterior and interior)

43 Charlotte Street

26 Lamboll Street

The Preservation Society currently holds over 78 exterior easements including 11 interior easements.

A preservation easement is a legal agreement between a property owner and a qualified easement holding organization that protects the architectural integrity of a property in perpetuity. Preservation easements protect the property from alterations and changes in use or density of a property, requiring the approval of the easement holding organization. If certain criteria are met the property owner can receive a Federal tax deduction. To qualify for a tax deduction, the property must be considered a “certified historic structure,” defined by the IRS as either individually listed in the National Register of Historic Places, or located in and contributing to a National Register of Historic Places-listed historic district. If you are interested in the preservation easement program, contact Robert Gurley, Assistant Director, at (843) 722-4630, fax (843) 723-4381, or e-mail at rgurley@preservationsociety.org.
Harlan Greene’s Spring Lecture Is A Literary Tour of Historic Places

The Preservation Society’s March 20th Spring Lecture and Reception was a delightful test of members’ recall about the Holy City’s rich literary history. Harlan Greene, well-known local author and current Project Archivist for the Avery Research Center for African-American History & Culture, led the audio-visual tour from the podium at the Charleston Museum.

His lecture was titled “Porgy Lived Here: Fictional Characters and the Real Places They Lived.” It visited the streets and houses where the extraordinary and timeless characters of Charleston-based fiction lived. While these characters sprang from the creative pens of DuBose Heyward, Josephine Pinckney and many other writers – the addresses and settings for their stories were and are very real. Some were well-known; others were more obscure.

- Where did Porgy and Bess live?
- Where did the Redcliffe’s have their Three O’Clock Dinner?
- Which house did the Devil visit in Great Mischief?
- What sites did Owen Wister use when creating the Western?
- Which downtown house was the site of a murder mystery?
- What character from a Nobel Prize winning author’s book visited a house on the Battery?

These and other riddles made for a fascinating glimpse into the literary heritage of Charleston. No doubt the lecture sent more than a few members back to their collections of Charleston-based books to revisit old friends who have entertained us well in the past.
other cities with a pockmarked skyline, disfiguring precious views and disinheriting future generations of Londoners.

To seek to protect historic views and vantage points, and oppose the planning of random new towers – for perhaps they would be better described as “vertical Cul-de-Sacs” or “Network Congestors”! – is not, I believe, synonymous with supporting what some have rather disparagingly called a “museum city.”

It is certainly legitimate to ask, I would have thought, how it can be considered sensible, or indeed rational, to implant such “congestors” into a network of streets which were designed to function with two to three storey buildings.

So, the key point I want to make is that I am not opposed to all tall buildings. My concern is that they should be considered in their context; in other words, they should be put where they fit properly. If new vertical cul-de-sacs are to be built, then it seems self-evident to me that they should stand together to establish a new skyline, and not compete with or confuse what is currently there – as has already happened to a depressing and disastrous extent.

If clustered, then the virtue of height becomes something that can, in the hands of creative architects, be truly celebrated. This solution, so clearly the case in Manhattan or La Défense in Paris, requires locations where intrusion into historically protected views, either at height or at street level, can be avoided, and is, therefore, difficult to justify in places such as the City of London where the pressure to build at height is often greatest.

There is a very real and urgent risk looming over us that in the drive to make historic cities like London and Edinburgh “world cities” in the commercial sense, we simply make them more like every other city in the world and in so doing dishonour and discredit their status, character and local distinctiveness.

In “A Vision of Britain,” I suggested that the impact of new buildings could be softened by an acceptance of the existing street rhythms and plot sizes. The buildings in a city such as London, Edinburgh or even Bath or Ealing are the individual brushstrokes of a grand composition, which works because all the participants understood the basic rules and “grammar,” with harmony being the pleasing result.

This lesson is, I believe, still as relevant today as it was in the Enlightenment, when builders sought to remake their cities to compete on a new stage.

For the past sixty years or so we have been conducting an experiment in social and environmental engineering that has gone disastrously wrong. Is it not time to say, in the words of William Cowper – that “Here the heart may give a useful lesson to the head, and learning wiser grow without his books?”
For me, the most exciting recipient of this years’ Carolopolis Award was 162 Spring Street. Built in the 1880s, this two-story frame single house operated as a barber shop since the 1950s. This is a great example of a historic building being altered to meet the changing needs of a given neighborhood. This alteration provided economic sustainability and contributed to the neighborhood’s preservation. Sometimes, old buildings need new ideas and new ideas can use old buildings. Thinking “green” as preservationists means we are not locked in time.

Speaking of time, I am looking forward to a great year for the Preservation Society. Thank you for joining me on this exciting journey.

Lois Lane

President, Board of Directors

Preservation Society of Charleston
Once again, preservation has a key role to play in the effort to correct this imbalance. Mr. Moe says our new challenge is to strive for “sustainability.” There was a time when most of the blame was focused on auto emissions. But EPA studies now indicate that cars, trucks, trains and aircraft account for only 27% of our greenhouse gas emissions; that 48% (nearly double that amount) is produced by the construction and operation of buildings. Globally, 10% of the entire world’s greenhouse gas problems come from America’s buildings!

Mr. Moe isn’t saying preservation is the key to solving America’s environmental crisis. But he does believe that sustainable development is an important step in the right direction. He says “Preservation is the ultimate recycling,” He points out that the connection between sustainability and historic preservation isn’t even new.

“The iconic poster of the old building in the shape of a gas can dates back more than a quarter century. It was the National Trust’s Preservation Week poster for 1980.” Today, the problem is far more widespread. Waiting for somebody to “fix it” won’t work any more; that we need to realize the “somebody.” Mr. Moe explains, “is us.”

We need to think of old buildings as repositories of energy; the accumulated bank account (of energy) spent to manufacture or extract the building’s raw materials; plus the energy spent to assemble those materials into a structure. When that building is demolished and its components sent to a landfill, all that accrued energy along with what is spent tearing it down is wasted. Add on the cost of constructing a new building to take its place and the total energy outlay is staggering. The bottom line is – if we can’t afford to build our way out of this predicament, we need to conserve our way out. We need to make better, wiser use of what we’ve already built.

Of course not every old building can be saved or reused, nor was every old building intended to last into perpetuity. This is especially true of too many of the buildings we’re putting up today. This is where our use of advocacy is so important. Shoddy materials and short-term thinking may seem like viable solutions when budgets are tight; but part of our job is to think in terms of the long run. We need to consider this in ALL new buildings – even utilitarian structures like warehouses, factories and parking garages.

The Brookings Institute reports that by 2030, America will have demolished and replaced 82 billion square feet (or about a third) of our current building stock. This is largely because a vast majority of these buildings weren’t designed to last in the first place. Doesn’t this amount to a deliberate waste of our resources on just about every level? Isn’t it time to rethink our built environment and be “greener” in the choices we make?

Alas, it seems poor Kermit the Frog may have missed the point. It is easy “being green.” First, you have to look – really look – and see – really see -- what’s already there.
Glenn F. Keyes has been named as one of the two South Carolina advisors to the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Previous Lowcountry advisors have included Ms. Vanessa Turner Maybank, Mr & Mrs. Joseph H. McGhee, Mr. Charles H. P. Duell and Mrs. Brantley Harvey, Jr. of Beaufort. This prestigious honor is a reflection of Mr. Keyes’ keen interest in the cause of preservation and his accomplishments in a remarkable career in architectural preservation to date. His resume includes service to many of America’s most iconic structures – including historic churches, commercial buildings, museum houses, as well as private residences. He is a former Board of Directors President of The Preservation Society and recipient of the prestigious National Preservation Honor Award given by the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

“We are honored that Glenn Keyes agreed to serve as Advisor for South Carolina,” said John Hildreth, Director of the National Trust’s Southern Regional Office. “He has incredible credentials, a passion for historic preservation and a willingness to share his time and expertise to further the cause of preservation.”

Mr. Keyes earned his undergraduate degree in Architecture at the University of Tennessee (1977) and his Master of Arts degree in Architecture at the University of Florida (1982) where his specialization was Historic Preservation. He is a member of the American Institute of Architects, the Association for Preservation Technology, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, as well as the Preservation Society of Charleston.
NEW BOARD MEMBER PROFILES

As 2008 rolls into another beautiful spring in Charleston, we pause to greet three Society Board Members who have agreed to serve this year with their invaluable gifts of talent, energy, insight and time.

**Rhondy Huff** is a native of Atlanta, Georgia, but she has called Charleston “home” for 22 years. She attended Converse College in Spartanburg majoring in Biology and Medical Technology and she earned her MAT Degree in Elementary Education from the College of Charleston.

Her involvement with the Society began “sometime in the 1990s” she recalls, “working the phones and taking ticket orders for the Fall Tours of Homes and Gardens.” Her current focus is on the Society’s Membership Committee. She describes herself as a “professional volunteer and mother.” The past five years she’s served on the Board of Directors for the Life Management Center Charleston.

“Like other non-profits these days,” she says, “the Society is challenged to solve the problems of fundraising and budgetary planning.” She is hoping the Society can find new ways to educate the public about our mission. “Preservation is more than preserving the past; preservation is also about the present – planning for and using our natural and man-made resources wisely as well as saving our structures.”

**Beau Clowney** was born in Greenville, South Carolina, and was raised in the capital city of Columbia. He attended undergraduate school at Tulane University where he earned a B.A. degree in Architecture. He went on to get his Master’s degree (also in Architecture) at Princeton University.

He moved to Charleston in 1994 and became involved with the Preservation Society about five years later. This is his second time serving on the Board. His earlier duties included being chair of the Planning and Zoning Committee. This chairmanship requires more time and commitment than any other committee appointment. Currently, Mr. Clowney is principal owner of Beau Clowney Design, a residential design firm.

“We are glad to have Beau Clowney back on our Board,” said Robert M. Gurley, Assistant Director of the Preservation Society. “His knowledge and experience as an advocate for our mission will be a tremendous asset to the Society.”

**J. Rutledge Young, III** hardly needs an introduction to the Preservation Society of Charleston, or does the Society need an introduction to him. His grandmother, Elizabeth Jenkins Young is an Advisor to the Board’s Executive Committee, a past President and one of four recipients of the Susan Pringle Frost Award. She is an integral part of the Society’s history and success. Rutledge grew up in Charleston with preservation issues part and parcel of daily life. He attended the University of Virginia studying History and he earned his Law Degree from the University of South Carolina Law School.

Today, Mr. Young is a practicing attorney with his own firm of Duffy & Young, LLC. His work with the Society officially began around 2000, he guesses, but his community involvement with the city’s heritage has been overlapping in many areas. He is a past board member of the Christian Family YMCA and First Scots Kindergarten. He is currently serving on the boards of Middleton Place Foundation and the University of South Carolina Law School Alumni Association. He is a member of the South Carolina Historical Society and Young Advocates of Historic Charleston Foundation.

“I look forward to learning more about the issues facing the Society today,” he says, “and helping with the ongoing realization of its mission.”
Mission of The Preservation Society of Charleston  
**FOUNDED IN 1920**

To inspire the involvement of all who dwell in the Lowcountry to honor and respect our material and cultural heritage.