APPENDIX F

Certificate of Appropriateness, 250 N. Center Street, Case ADM23-00081, issued April 5, 2023

Property	260 N. Center Street, Mesa, Arizona 85201 (APN 138-59-045)
Appellant	Alicia Rodriguez, owner
Appeal of	Denial of Certificate of Appropriateness, Case ADM26-00657, dated August 10, 2026
Related permit	PMT26-01976
Prior approval	Certificate of Appropriateness, Case ADM25-00154, issued June 11, 2025
Hearing	Historic Preservation Board, Tuesday, September 1, 2026, 5:00 p.m., Mesa City Hall, 20 E. Main Street

Document reproduced

The City of Mesa Certificate of Appropriateness for 250 N. Center Street, Case ADM23-00081, APN 138-59-046, signed by Maura Jackson, Historic Preservation Advisor and Planner, and issued April 5, 2023, with Attachment 1. The applicants of record are Sean Derek Rodriguez and Alicia Romero, the same owners as 260 N. Center Street. The letter is copied to Mary Kopaskie-Brown, Planning Director and Historic Preservation Officer, and to Michelle Dahlke, Principal Planner.

What this document covers, stated plainly

The appellant submits this document with an accurate description of its scope rather than leaving that to inference. Case ADM23-00081 approved a rear addition at 250 N. Center Street. Its project description states that the north, east, and south facades of the existing house will remain unchanged and that the existing windows on the original house will remain intact. The appellant makes no claim that this case approved new work on the front facade, because none was proposed.

The arched porch openings at 250 N. Center Street are original to the 1945 construction and have never been altered. The appellant and her husband own and live at 250 N. Center Street and did not build those openings. That is precisely why the 2023 project description states that the east facade would remain unchanged: no work was proposed there, and the original arches remained in place. The City reviewed this property in 2023 with those arched openings on its front elevation, described the property's character-defining features, found the project consistent with every applicable Standard, and recorded that the front facade would remain as it was.

Why this document is offered

1. It establishes the shared district context for the two adjacent properties. Both 250 and 260 N. Center Street sit in the West Second Street Historic District, with a period of significance from 1883 to 1959, both zoned Downtown Core with a Historic District overlay, and both classified as contributing. Attachment 1 records that 250 N. Center Street was constructed in 1945 as the home of Charles J. Helber.

2. The City has again identified character-defining features property by property, and again by reference to form rather than applied ornament. For 250 N. Center Street the City describes a low-pitch intersecting pyramidal roof, original wood double-hung and wood casement windows, and a stucco exterior.

For 260 N. Center Street the City describes the shallow front porch and the broad front facade. In neither case does the City identify decorative gable trim as a character-defining feature.

3. The City has treated architectural simplicity at 250 as a virtue. Attachment 1 states that this home:

> *"lacks high-style detailing and the simplicity of the design is unique when compared to other homes within the district."*

The appellant notes the difference in treatment. At 250 N. Center Street the City described a simple 1945 house without high-style detailing and approved the work before it. At 260 N. Center Street, a house the City classifies as a modest example of the Ranch style, the presence or absence of applied decorative trim has become the basis for denial under five Standards.

4. It shows how the same office applied the same Standards to the adjacent property. The Attachment 1 checklist for 250 N. Center Street marks Standards 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, and 10 Consistent, with Standards 4, 7, and 8 marked not applicable. The checklist for 260 N. Center Street in Case ADM25-00154 marks Standards 1 through 7, 9, and 10 Consistent, with Standard 8 not applicable. Two adjacent contributing houses of the same era, in the same district, owned by the same family, were each found fully consistent with these Standards. The decision of August 10, 2026 departs from both records.

5. Arched porch openings are original 1945 fabric on the adjacent contributing property, and the City has treated them as fabric to be preserved.

The August 5, 2026 letter states that rounded or arched porch features "would be atypical of the house's architectural style and could create a false sense of history," and that applying design elements taken from houses of different architectural styles would also be inconsistent with Standard 3. The house immediately next door, built the same year, on the same block, in the same district, and classified by the City as contributing, has arched porch openings that are original to its 1945 construction. In 2023 the City reviewed that property and recorded that its front facade would remain unchanged.

Standard 3 exists to prevent a viewer from being misled into believing an invented feature is original historic fabric. A rounded opening on a 1945 house on this block is not invented and is not borrowed from a different place or period. It is documented original fabric fifty feet away, on a property the City has reviewed and protected. The appellant recognizes that the City classifies 250 N. Center Street as National Folk and 260 N. Center Street as Ranch, and does not argue that the two houses share a single design vocabulary. The point is narrower and, the appellant submits, decisive on this Standard: a form that existed here in 1945, and that the City preserves as original next door, cannot create a false sense of historical development when it is echoed at a few inches of radius on plainly new porch framing. The rounded edges at 260 N. Center Street also repeat an arched form documented inside this very house before any of the appellant's work began (Appendix E).

Note: this document is already in the City's records. It is reproduced here so that the Board has the full scope of the 2023 approval before it, described accurately, rather than characterized.

mesa·az
HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

April 5, 2023

APPLICANT: Sean Derek Rodriguez and Alicia Romero
EMAIL: [redacted]
[redacted]

Subject: Certificate of Appropriateness (Historic Clearance) for 250 N. Center (the "Subject Property") (Case Number ADM23-00081 APN/Parcel # 138-59-046, West 2nd Street Historic District)

Dear Sean and Alicia,

The City of Mesa Historic Preservation Office has reviewed your request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed exterior alterations to the Subject Property.

The City Historic Preservation Officer has reviewed your request and determined it **complies** with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. In addition, the modifications are **consistent** with City's historic standards and guidelines. The Historic Preservation Officer has therefore **approved** the Certificate of Appropriateness request based on the analysis completed on Attachment 1 of this decision letter.

If you have additional questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely

Maura Jackson

Maura Jackson, Historic Preservation Advisor/Planner
City of Mesa

cc: Mary Kopaskie-Brown, Planning Director/Historic Preservation Officer
Michelle Dahlke, Principal Planner

Enclosures:

1) Attachment 1

mesa·az
HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

April 5, 2023

ATTACHMENT 1

Background:

The Subject Property is located at 250 N. Center within the West 2nd Street Historic District (the "District") which has a period of significance from 1883 to1959. The zoning designation for the Subject Property is Downtown Core District ("DC") with an Historic District ("HD") overlay.

The residence was constructed in 1945 as the home of Charles J. Helber. The home exhibits a low-pitch, intersecting pyramidal roof, original wood double-hung and wood casement windows, a stucco exterior, and it is a contributor to the District. The home lacks high-style detailing and the simplicity of the design is unique when compared to other homes within the district.

Project Description:

Proposed work for this Certificate of Appropriateness request includes a rear addition. The addition will extend the rear rooms and will connect to the existing rear wall. The addition will retain about half of the existing rear wall, utilizing existing openings. The addition includes master closets, two bathrooms, an office, and mudroom. The proposed materials for the addition include stucco to match the existing and rolled roofing. The north, east, and south facades of the existing house will remain unchanged. The existing windows on the original house will remain intact.

US Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation – Rehabilitation

Standard	Consistent	Inconsistent	N/A
A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.	☒	☐	☐
The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.	☒	☐	☐
Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.	☒	☐	☐
Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.	☐	☐	☒
Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Consistent	Inconsistent	N/A
Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.	☒	☐	☐
Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.	☐	☐	☒
Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.	☐	☐	☒
New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. **Guidelines recommend: Constructing a new addition on a secondary or non-character defining elevation and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.** **Ensuring that the addition is subordinate and secondary to the historic building and is compatible in massing, scale, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.**	☒	☐	☐
New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.	☒	☐	☐

mesa·az
HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

April 5, 2023

City of Mesa Historic Homes of Mesa: An Architectural and Preservation Guide
New Addition Design Standards – Dos and Don'ts

Standard	Consistent	Inconsistent	N/A
Construct new exterior additions to the side or the rear of a historic building to retain the streetscape façade and the setback to the street.	☒	☐	☐
Remove non-significant additions or nearby outbuildings to make room for a new exterior addition if removal does not affect the architectural integrity of the building.	☐	☐	☒
Design the new addition to complement and enhance the historic building in size, scale, materials, and details. **Don't: construct an addition which is larger in size or inappropriate in scale to the original building.**	☒	☐	☐
Verify zoning restrictions for heights, setbacks, and building separation to define the buildable area within the property. Take into consideration overhang dimensions when determining the allowable building envelope. Setback and lot coverage variances may be difficult to obtain if zoning problems are self-imposed by the applicant's own design.	☒	☐	☐
Design non-historic site features and landscaping as distinctive but compatible with the building's historic style.	☐	☐	☒