WRITTEN NOTICE OF APPEAL AND PROJECT NARRATIVE

Certificate of Appropriateness Appeal to the Mesa Historic Preservation Board

---

Appellant: Alicia Rodriguez, Owner
Property: 260 N. Center Street, Mesa, AZ 85201 (APN/Parcel 138-59-045)
Case appealed: ADM26-00657 (Certificate of Appropriateness, denied August 10, 2026)
Related permit: PMT26-01976
District: West Second Street Historic District (Downtown Core with Historic District overlay)

Part 1 — Written Notice of Appeal

Submitted pursuant to Mesa Zoning Ordinance Section 11-77-4(B). The information required under that section is provided below.

a) Date of the appeal: August 11, 2026.

b) Appellant and representative: Alicia Rodriguez, owner of the Subject Property. I am representing myself; there is no separate representative.

c) Address to which notices should be sent: 250 N. Center Street, Mesa, AZ 85201.

d) Contact information: Telephone [redacted]gmail.com.

e) Action or decision being appealed, and its date: The denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed exterior alterations at 260 N. Center Street, Case ADM26-00657, issued by the Historic Preservation Officer on August 10, 2026.

f) Requested outcome if the appeal is granted: That the Historic Preservation Board reverse the denial and approve the three proposed exterior details described in Part 2 below.

g) Grounds for the appeal: The three proposed details are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and with the City's own Certificate of Appropriateness for this property. In particular, the City's August 10, 2026 decision itself marks Standards 9 and 10 “Consistent,” confirming that the new work is differentiated, compatible, and fully reversible. The detailed grounds, responding to each of Standards 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6, are set out in the accompanying Appeal Letter and Exhibit A, which are incorporated here by reference.

h) Address and case number associated with the appeal: 260 N. Center Street, Mesa, AZ 85201; Case ADM26-00657; APN/Parcel 138-59-045; related permit PMT26-01976.

Part 2 — Detailed Narrative of the Proposed Work

We are appealing the denial of three small, non-structural, and fully reversible exterior details. None of the three changes the footprint, the roofline, or any character-defining historic feature of the house. The City's own decision identifies the character-defining elements of this Ranch-style home as the shallow front porch and the broad front façade; none of the three items alters either. Each item is described below, with its material and dimension.

1. Gable ends finished in durable stucco, where the removed dog-ear trim was.

The decorative dog-eared wood trim in the gables could not be salvaged. It was removed out of necessity — not preference — as part of the remediation this home required to be safe and habitable. The property was abated for asbestos and lead-based paint, and the structure suffered termite damage and water intrusion. These conditions are documented both in the City's own approved Certificate of Appropriateness and in the independent inspection and appraisal report commissioned by the prior owner, [redacted] as part of her sale of the property to us — a neutral, third-party record prepared before we took ownership. There was nothing to preserve; leaving deteriorated, pest- and moisture-damaged wood in place would have been neither safe nor consistent with the home's rehabilitation. We are not reinstalling or "finishing" a wood gable. The wood gable elements were removed entirely, and the smooth/sand-finish stucco already approved for the home's walls is carried up the wall to cover the full area where the gable elements had been — so the wall reads as one continuous, durable stucco surface with no wood gable elements remaining. This is the material the approved Certificate of Appropriateness expressly authorizes for these elements ("retained or replaced in-kind or with a similar more durable material") and the same "new smooth/sand finish stucco" the COA approves across the rest of the home and that is used on our adjacent home at 250 N. Center Street. Reinstalling exterior wood here would be inappropriate: wood fails repeatedly in Arizona's extreme heat, re-invites termites, and imposes unnecessary ongoing maintenance and expense on any future occupant. **Material:** smooth/sand-finish stucco (as approved for the home's walls), carried up to cover the entire former gable area; no wood gable elements remain.

2. Low pony wall — 34 inches tall, 13 feet 6 inches long.

A low wall along the front porch, thirty-four inches tall (under three feet) and thirteen feet six inches long. It is attached to the new porch posts — not to the original 1945 structure — and can be removed in the future without affecting the historic building. It does not enclose the porch. It provides basic safety and privacy from the street, which has changed substantially since 1945; the City's own record describes the district's transformation "from a rural community to suburban estates," and Center Street today is a high-traffic route into downtown Mesa. **Dimensions:** 34 inches tall, 13 feet 6 inches long. **Attachment:** fixed to the new porch posts; fully reversible.

3. Softly rounded porch edges.

A soft, rounded edge — a radius of only a few inches — at the top corners of the porch openings, tucked beneath the porch beam. These are not an ornate archway; they are a subtle detail that echoes the arched openings already inside the home, giving the house one coherent design language inside and out. They are built onto the new porch framing and are fully reversible. **Dimension:** a few-inch radius at each opening. **Attachment:** part of the new porch framing; fully reversible.

Reversibility (Standards 9 and 10). All three items are new work built onto new framing, not alterations of the original 1945 fabric. If any were removed in the future, the historic structure would be

unimpaired. The City's August 10, 2026 decision marks both Standard 9 (new work differentiated and compatible) and Standard 10 (reversibility) “Consistent” — confirming this point in the City's own findings.

Part 3 — Summary of Grounds

The denial rests on Standards 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6, each of which assumes these features are original, essential, Ranch-style character. They are not:

- The City classifies the home as a “modest example of the Ranch style,” a style defined by minimal ornamentation; the character-defining elements the City identifies are the shallow porch and broad façade, not decorative gable trim.
- The City’s support for treating the gable trim as “original” rests on a photograph from the 2002 National Register nomination. As the Historic Preservation Officer himself noted in his June 10, 2025 email transmitting that photograph, it is “a photo of the home from the National Register nomination (2002).” A 2002 photograph establishes only that the trim was present in 2002 — not that it was original to the home’s 1945 construction. The City’s own evidence therefore does not establish that the removed trim was historic fabric. (That email is included as Appendix A.)
- The dog-ear trim could not be salvaged and was removed out of necessity, as part of the documented remediation of termites, water intrusion, and asbestos and lead-paint abatement. Stucco — the durable material the approved COA authorizes and approves across the home — now finishes the gable, and a return to exterior wood would be unreasonable in this climate. The condition is documented by the City's own COA and by the prior owner's independent appraisal.
- Arched and rounded openings are established throughout this district on contributing homes the City itself classifies as Spanish Eclectic, Mission Revival, and similar styles — so they cannot be “conjectural” here — and the same features were approved at our adjacent home, 250 N. Center Street.
- All three items are reversible new work, which the City's own decision marks “Consistent” under Standards 9 and 10.

The full, standard-by-standard grounds are set out in the accompanying Appeal Letter and Exhibit A.

Part 4 — Materials Submitted with This Appeal

1. This Written Notice of Appeal and Project Narrative.

2. Appeal Letter with Exhibit A (detailed grounds responding to Standards 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6).

3. Appeal Presentation (16 pages). All photographs of the building and site — including detail photographs of the deteriorated dog-ear trim, the 34-inch wall measurement, the porch openings, and the comparison home at 250 N. Center — are included within this presentation.

4. Independent inspection and appraisal report (File 296141133), commissioned by the prior owner, [redacted], as part of the sale of the property to us. It contains additional photographs of the property's original condition and documents the “damaged wood trim” and “damaged eaves” and the deteriorated conditions that required remediation.

5. Front elevation marked to identify the material and dimension of each of the three proposed alterations.

6. West Second Street Historic District Contributing Property List (City document).

7. Appendix A — the Historic Preservation Officer's June 10, 2025 email transmitting the 2002 National Register nomination photograph, in which he identifies the image as "a photo of the home from the National Register nomination (2002)."

Photographs. All required photographs of the building and site, including detail photographs, are contained within the Appeal Presentation and the inspection/appraisal report identified above; they are not attached as separate files.

Construction drawings. The three appealed alterations are fully identified — with materials and dimensions — on the marked front elevation provided. We are not submitting the full field construction drawing set, as the three items at issue in this appeal are limited in scope and are completely depicted on the marked elevation.

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia Rodriguez
Owner, 260 N. Center Street | [redacted]gmail.com