



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649  
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

LPB 14/15

### MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting  
Seattle Municipal Tower  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Room 4060  
Wednesday, January 7, 2015 - 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Deb Barker  
Robert Ketcherside  
Aaron Luoma  
Valerie Porter  
Sarah Shadid  
Matthew Sneddon  
Mike Stanley  
Alison Walker Brems, Chair  
Elaine Wine

#### Staff

Sarah Sodt  
Erin Doherty  
Melinda Bloom

#### Absent

Linda Amato  
Nick Carter  
Jeffrey Murdock, Vice Chair

Chair Alison Walker Brems called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**010715.1**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

December 3, 2014

MM/SC/EW/AL

7:0:2 Minutes approved. Ms. Porter and Mr. Stanley  
abstained.

**010715.2**

#### **DESIGNATION**

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program  
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

010715.21

Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co. Building  
1525 11th Avenue

Ms. Walker Brems explained the meeting's nomination and designation process.

David Peterson prepared and presented the designation report (full report in DON file). He explained that he would provide a summary of the nomination material and address board comments from the nomination meeting. He said the building was designed for Oscar Willet by Julian Everett for the Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Company which sold trucks as well as tires. He provided context of the neighborhood and noted its early auto row and its siting near one of the earliest parks in the City. He said that a number of car dealerships are located on corners and this one is mid-block; he noted corner sites provide more opportunity for embellishment. He provided photos of some local auto row buildings including Seattle Automobile Company, Lieback Garage, Packard Dealership, and the Pontiac Dealership.

Mr. Peterson said that the Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Company only lasted a few years – it went bankrupt in 1924 although the tire portion of the company is still around. He reported that the building supported both sides of the business: the main entry was to the right of center with the tire company on the right with less space and the car dealership on the left. He said that the building housed other occupants over time but that the most prominent was REI who occupied the building for 30 years. He said that REI occupied four buildings on the block that were all connected together.

Mr. Peterson said that Julian Everett was best known for his residential and church design and for the Pioneer Square Pergola. He said that the adjacent White Motor Company building is a better example of his commercial work.

He said that the elevator is intact but that most windows have been replaced – one remains. He said on the back side is a parking lot and loading dock; there is an easement and not an alley. He said that openings on that side were shrunk when the window changed. He said the raised tile work is still above the main entry beneath the awning. He said the interior is wide open and an original window faces the easement. He said that the building does not meet the criteria for designation and noted that the features from REI's time in the building are gone.

Jessica Clawson, McCullough, Hill, Leary, said the building did not meet the criteria for designation. She said that it doesn't meet the double significance of C. She said that the building doesn't have the ability to convey that REI was there; she said that REI did not start or end there and was only there for a time. She said that REI does not have an attachment to this building. She cited the Blue Moon Tavern which she said was an ordinary building that couldn't convey anything. She said that the building did not meet Criterion D

because it is not on a corner nor is it highly decorated. She said that there are many other better examples. She said the building is not an outstanding work of the architect and cited the Pathé or White Motor Company as better examples so it did not meet Criterion E.

Ms. Wine asked where REI had moved from when they moved into this building.

Mr. Peterson said that they moved from Pike Street downtown to this building and they later bought this and three other adjacent buildings.

Ms. Barker asked when this and the White buildings were constructed.

Mr. Peterson said that this building was constructed in 1917 and the White Building was built in 1916.

Public Comment:

Bob Knutson, Capital Hill resident, commented on the importance of REI which he said is an iconic Seattle business that is right up there with the Space Needle. He said that REI didn't start at this building but it came of age there and it is a very important building. He said that REI representative spoke at the nomination how important this building was to their business. He said it is great when we honor and respect the past and we need to do it more.

Dennis Saxman said the whole building meets the criteria for designation. He noted the wood trusses and narrow strip ceiling, vast spaces, windows which convey use and provide light and ventilation. He said that there were blocks and blocks of auto row buildings and there were only so many corner spaces available so its siting has no relevance to its importance. He said that relevant to REI is that part of the auto craze was auto camping and REI was a part in that it supplied that. He said that auto touring was an important for tourism on the west coast and in the US. He noted the loss of terracotta and said that the building can be a landmark even if ordinary and said it played an important role in the area and is part of a culture.

Eugenia Woo, representing Historic Seattle and Washington Trust, supported designation on criteria C and D. She said that 'use' is not being landmarked but auto row and REI associations are significant. She said the history of a building keeps going and evolving and REI's occupancy shows the evolution of use and the adaptability of this building. She said the building meets the criteria. She said she heard a strange parsing out by the applicant of what a landmark is which doesn't make sense. She noted the strength of community comments which she said provided the biggest statement about the significance of the building. She applauded the community for their input.

#### Board Discussion:

Ms. Barker supported designation and said the building meets C and D. She agreed that it has auto/vehicle row integrity because of the large windows which promoted the sales of vehicles. She said that truck sales mid-block makes sense. She said she agreed with the cultural and economic significance of REI's occupancy and what occurred there as well as Jim Whittaker's association.

Mr. Sneddon supported designation on criteria C, D, and F. He noted the significance of the building and the national and regional aspects of the auto explosion on economic and cultural life. He noted the concentration of various aspects such as the significance of the development of the auto industry as well as logging in the northwest. He said that the structure still conveys what it was with its design – wide windows, trusses, wood floors. He commented on the semi-circular raised element over the entry, the columns, floor and structural system. He noted the outpouring of the community and said it is a distinctive part of the neighborhood.

Ms. Shadid supported designation on criteria C and D and said the building was significantly associated with the economy of auto row and trucking. She said the exterior does convey its use with the smaller tire business on one side and the cars on the other – she said it still conveys that. She noted its weight bearing structure.

Mr. Luoma supported designation on criteria C and D and noted that it has the ability to convey its significance as an auto row building. He said double significance doesn't mean it has to be the only or in the top three. He said that with architectural integrity it can still convey that even with the loss of windows. He said that 'use' is not designated but the REI connection is significant.

Mr. Ketcherside supported designation on criteria C and D. He said that he researched and wrote about auto row and there should be an auto row district; he said the overlay was a mistake and constrains the ability to save more. He said this one merits designation and he noted that regarding criterion C REI had a long tenure there. He said that a building doesn't have to be the fanciest but maybe this one was the fanciest in truck sales. He said the building has plenty of decoration and he said the same is true of the White Motor Building next door. He noted the attempt to have the rooflines read coherently on the block. He said that it is part of the same cadre of building and retains the mass, envelope and form; he said that even if the windows were changed the openings are still there.

Ms. Wine said that she was 'on the fence' about the integrity and noted it is a modest auto row building with loss of windows. She said that the expenses

are there. She said that as a whole auto row and REI associations are very important. She said that REI really embodies the Pacific Northwest and what that is to live in the northwest; she said the importance can't be denied. She said that there is enough significance in auto row and REI associations that she would support designation on criteria C and D.

Mr. Stanley supported designation; he said that REI grew up there and that is important.

Ms. Walker Brems said that the significance of REI overcomes any integrity issues.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the Kelly-Springfield Motor Truck Co. Building at 1525 11th Avenue as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standards C, and D; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include the exterior of the building and the site.

MM/SC/RK/DB 9:0:0 Motion carried.

**010715.3 NOMINATIONS**

010715.31 Eberharter Garage  
503 Westlake Avenue North

Seth Startup, developer, cited a DPD report that said the building fails to meet the criteria.

Regina Green, owner, said they do not support nomination.

David Peterson, Nicholson Kovalchick, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the neighborhood and site and said the building was constructed in 1919 as an auto garage. He noted the concentration of auto related shops in the area. He said that the concrete, post and beam building has two elevations with rough stucco finish exterior. There are concrete decorative elements painted green. He said that all upper windows have been replaced with modern sash windows. He said that windows on south and west first floor are covered with plywood; the original windows might be there. He said that the alley windows have been filled in and the main street has been altered. He said that there is a three bay front with freight elevator in the back; bathrooms and stairs are still there. He said that the expanse of first floor interior remains and the second floor has wide open space and exposed timber construction and brick sills.

Mr. Peterson said the Beezer Brothers were from Pennsylvania and did a lot of Beaux Arts work. They came to Seattle in 1907 and designed the Colman Dock,

Blessed Sacrament Church, O’Dea High School as well as banks, Catholic Churches and hospitals. He said they eventually established a San Francisco office. He said that this building was the ‘oddball’ and that perhaps someone in their office did it because it is so different from their other work.

He reported that Adolph J. Eberharter developed buildings along Dexter Avenue and this was his garage. He said that Hemphill Diesel School operated out of this building; they were founded in Los Angeles and had schools all over the country. He said that there are other service buildings, garages, and auto related buildings in the neighborhood. He said there have been significant alterations to the windows. He said there is no significant association with Eberharter or Hemphil. He said there are many work force structures in the City. He said the building is visible on the corner and stands out only because of newly constructed larger building.

*Mr. Sneddon left at 4:45 pm.*

Mr. Ketcherside asked if it was a service building rather than showroom.

Mr. Peterson said yes.

Ms. Barker asked about information on original uses and if there are floor plans, layouts, functions, and elevations, etc.

Mr. Peterson said there is no indication of other uses and noted the lightweight concrete floor on top of wood which suggests drive in service. He said that cars would go up elevator to second floor where there were parts, tires and storage.

Ms. Wine asked if the southwest corner window is original.

Mr. Peterson said that the transom window is.

Public Comment:

Eugenie Woo, Historic Seattle, supported nomination on C, D, E and F. She noted a recent DON survey of South Lake Union.

Ms. Sodt said that this building was noted as one of the most important buildings identified by the recent survey and was identified by the consultants as being likely eligible for landmark designation.

Ms. Woo said that even before all the changes in South Lake Union this building always jumped out. She said that like the previous building reviewed this one does not have the original windows but the openings are there. She said the building conveys its significance and that she appreciates the stewardship.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Wine supported nomination and said it was ‘remarkable’; she said she has noticed it and been charmed by it for years. She said that its design is simplistic and the loss of the windows is less of an issue because of the large expanse. She said that the building reads as industrial and it conveys its significance and original use. She said it is a highly contributing building to the neighborhood and she supported nomination on criteria D and F.

Ms. Shadid supported nomination and said the building is unusual and one of the very few left in this quickly changing neighborhood. She said it speaks to the second wave of auto rows and noted the corner location and expanse of windows.

Ms. Porter supported nomination and noted the window layout and integrity, gabled roof, and said the building has the ability to convey its significance.

Mr. Luoma supported nomination and said he works nearby and is familiar with the building; he said he knew the building before the area development and it grabbed his attention. He noted the glazing and its intention to showcase and serve. He said the character of the corner speaks to its era. He said it is not a strong landmark but it commands attention.

Mr. Ketcherside supported nomination; he said he had lived nearby and the building stood out.

Ms. Barker said the building is very modest and the purity of the original design shows. She said she supported nomination. She said the window expanse is still there; the building was built to let light in and it still does that.

Mr. Stanley did not support nomination. He said it did not meet criterion C, has no great architectural style, is a poor example of Beezer Brothers’ work, although it does stand out in the neighborhood.

Mr. Walker Brems said a well-designed building doesn’t have to be expensive and fancy. She said the building has always stood out to her. She noted the proportion, size and how it sits on the corner and said it meets criterion F. She asked if the original windows are behind the plywood.

Mr. Peterson said that they are.

Ms. Wine suggested including the interior because much of the original structure is exposed and in place.

Ms. Walker Brems and Mr. Ketcherside agreed.

Action: I move that the Board approve the nomination of the Eberharter Garage located at 503 Westlake Avenue North for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include: the interior and exterior of the building; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for February 18, 2015; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

MM/SC/DB/VP 7:1:0 Motion carried. Mr. Stanley opposed.

010715.32

Henry R. Wold Building  
413 Fairview Avenue North

Roger Pierce said the building doesn't have the significant association or ability to convey importance. He said the building is not an outstanding work of the architect. He said that the building does not have integrity.

David Peterson, Nicholson Kovalchick, prepared and presented the nomination report (full report in DON file). He provided context of the site and neighborhood and an overview of the area's light industrial history.

He said that architect Victor Voorhees designed the one-story building with full height basement. He said the building is cast in place concrete with board formed walls with high fired red pressed brick front, post and beam, and flat roof with skylights. He said that all windows have been replaced with modern sash. He said that only a little of the south elevation is exposed from the alley.

Mr. Peterson said that the interior is chopped up and has housed a variety of occupants over time. He said that owner A. C. Goerig was an excavator who was involved with the widening of the streets among other projects. He said that this was an investment property. The building housed the Saxony Knitting Company which was one of many garment industries in Seattle; it invented the one-piece bathing suit for women and made jerseys for UW and WASU. He said that Alvin Metzger purchased the business and turned it into the largest sweater manufacturer in the west. He said that there was lots of light and air inside.

He said that Voorhees was prolific; he provided photos of some of his other works including the Georgetown City Hall, Knights of Pythias, Washington Arms Apartments, Vance Building, Vance Hotel, and Joseph Vance building. He said that this was not one of Voorhees' better works. He said that the building did not meet any of the criteria for nomination.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:



Ms. Barker said she was ‘on the fence’ and said she wished there were more old photos. She appreciated the information on Goerig.

Mr. Ketcherside did not support nomination although he said the building was handsome.

Mr. Luoma did not support nomination and while it had a sense of quality and character it didn’t have the same presence as the previously reviewed building. He said the brick stands out and the lack of original windows didn’t bother him.

Ms. Porter said the building was interesting but didn’t rise to the level of landmark; she noted overall lack of integrity.

Ms. Shadid said there were a few interesting elements but the building didn’t rise to the level of a landmark.

Mr. Stanley did not support nomination but noted that it was interesting that the façade was done by the original architect.

Ms. Wine did not support nomination and said the building didn’t stand out. She said that it lacks a presence and a cohesiveness. She said the siting and the proportions were odd and it was lacking integrity due to the loss of windows.

Ms. Walker Brems did not support nomination and said that this building didn’t stand out nor did it rise to the level of a landmark.

Action: I move that the Board not approve the nomination of the Henry R. Wold Building at 413 Fairview Avenue North as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not meet any of the designation Standards of SMC 25.12. 350.

MM/SC/EW/RK 8:0:0 Motion carried.

**010715.4 STAFF REPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator