



# FULL HISTORIC REVIEW

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DATE: APRIL 14, 2026

**ACTIVITY NUMBER:** SD-0725-00102  
**RELATED ACTIVITY NUMBERS:** TC-RES-0325-01651/TC-RES-0425-01872/CE-VIO0325-01045  
**LOCATION:** 605 E 4TH ST/710 N 2ND AV (PARCEL #117033640)  
**ZONING:** HR-2  
**HISTORIC ZONE/DISTRICT:** WEST UNIVERSITY HPZ  
**APPLICANT:** ALEX ENOCH  
**PROJECT NAME:** ZONING VIOLATION/REHABILITATION/NEW ADU  
**STAFF CONTACT:** DESIREE ARANDA, HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER

### PROPOSED PROJECT

The review is to comply with a Code Enforcement case at 605 E 4th St due to the installation of vinyl sliding windows that did not fit existing window openings. The applicant proposes to replace the vinyl sliding windows with aluminum clad wood windows, replace stairs at the back patio, repair stucco, and repaint the exterior of the existing home at 605 E 4th St. A new 45" wrought iron fence is proposed along a portion of the west property line. The project also includes demolition of an existing non-contributing garage and construction of a new one-story detached 787 sq. ft. Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) at the rear of the property (with an address of 710 N 2nd Ave). The proposed ADU would be lower in height than the main house and have a gable roof with red asphalt shingles, stucco cladding with sand finish in a tan color, a recessed entry with wood door featuring six-lites and two panels, and aluminum clad wood windows. The proposed ADU will require a setback waiver for a proposed setback of one ft. at the north property boundary (minimum 5 ft. setback is required per code).

WUHZAB reviewed the project at its February 10, 2026 meeting and voted to continue the item to a future meeting to allow the applicant to return with window types that meet the West University Historic Preservation Zone Design Guidelines. WUHZAB also recommended approval of the demolition of the non-contributing metal garage. See attached Legal Action Report (LAR) for more information.

### PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

The property is approximately 0.15 acres or 6,620 SF and contains a duplex with two addresses on same parcel. Built in 1917, it is a contributor to the West University Historic Preservation Zone (HPZ). The duplex is one of numerous bungalows in the area. It is a one-story brick building clad in stucco with a gable and hip roof, brown asphalt shingles, and four chimneys. The building has undergone various modifications and additions but still has sufficient integrity to convey its significance.

### APPLICABLE PRESERVATION STANDARDS

Pursuant to provisions of Section 5.8.9 of the City of Tucson Unified Development Code (UDC), the proposed

project was reviewed for compliance with historic preservation standards by the Historic Preservation Office (CHPO). Applicable preservation standards include:

- Section 5.8 of the City of Tucson Unified Development Code (UDC)
- Technical Standards Manual Section 9-02
- The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation
- West University Historic Preservation Zone Design Guidelines

**PUBLIC/NEIGHBORHOOD INPUT**

The Department has not received any public comments regarding the proposed project.

**ZONING & BUILDING CODE REQUIREMENTS**

This review applies only to the project’s compliance with historic preservation standards. Compliance with all other applicable zoning and building code regulations is required to obtain a building permit. Changes made to the plan to achieve compliance with these other code requirements may require another review for compliance with historic preservation standards.

The proposed ADU will require setback waiver for the requested 1 ft. setback at the north property line (5 ft. setback is required per code).

**STAFF FINDINGS**

**Proposed Alterations to Existing Contributing Duplex:**

Historic Preservation staff find that the proposed work for the existing duplex conforms with preservation standards.

- Windows will fit existing openings and be double-hung aluminum clad wood windows featuring a lite pattern similar to the original with multiple divided lights at the top half.
- Stucco repair, paint, and replacement rear steps will result in minimal exterior changes
- Proposed fence is compatible with HPZ and development zone

Contributing Property Modifications & Additions (UDC 5.8, TSM 9-02.7.0, SOI Standards, HPZ Design Guidelines)			
S	D	NA	
			S - satisfies    D - does not satisfy    NA - not applicable
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <b><u>Minimal Exterior Changes</u></b> Exterior alterations and changes are minimal; property to be used as it was historically or given new use that requires minimal change to distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <b><u>Visibility</u></b> Alterations or renovations visible from the street are minimal
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(3) <b><u>Height</u></b> Height generally conforms to typical height within development zone; new additions are no higher than the tallest contributor of the same use in the development zone (e.g. principal buildings are compared to principal buildings, accessory structures are compared to accessory structures except for Accessory Dwelling Units, which are compared to primary buildings); and height of new buildings are compatible with the height of neighboring contributing historic properties.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(4) <b><u>Roof Types</u></b> New or replaced roof is compatible in configuration, mass, and materials to that of the existing structure

- |                                     |                          |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (5) <b><u>Setbacks</u></b><br>Maintains prevailing street and interior perimeter yard setbacks within its development zone   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (6) <b><u>Site Utilization</u></b><br>Spacing between buildings is consistent with that of contributors within the development zone  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (7) <b><u>Building Form</u></b><br>Size, scale and mass of additions are compatible with existing structure and with contributors in development zone  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (8) <b><u>Proportion</u></b><br>Changes are consistent with proportions of existing structure and with prevailing proportions of contributing properties within development zone   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (9) <b><u>Projections and Recessions</u></b><br>Appropriate to the style of the existing structure   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (10) <b><u>Rhythm</u></b><br>Proportion, patterns and rhythm of openings, including at additions, are compatible with those of existing structure and those of contributors within development zone  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (11) <b><u>Windows &amp; Doors</u></b><br>The size, shape, and materials of window and door openings are maintained; repair options fully explored before replacement is considered; removals/infills are limited to only where necessary; evidence of original opening is maintained; where replacement is the only option, the new features will match the original  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (12) <b><u>Materials</u></b><br>All construction materials are appropriate to the building and to the neighborhood   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (13) <b><u>Surface Textures</u></b><br>Appropriate to historical style of existing structure; and may be differentiated at additions   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (14) <b><u>Colors</u></b><br>Appropriate to architectural style of structure and historic period (may only be considered as part of a required HPZ review)   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (15) <b><u>Character-Defining Features</u></b><br>(a) Alterations or changes to character-defining features are minimal; any historical and distinctive architectural details remain<br>(b) Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship are preserved; No chemical or physical treatments that would cause damage to historic materials<br>(c) Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved<br>(d) Repair options fully explored before replacement is considered; where replacement is the only option, the new features will match the old; replacement of missing features substantiated by documentary and physical evidence |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (16) <b><u>Architectural Style</u></b><br>Architectural style of alterations and new construction is compatible but differentiated from historic structure on site and surrounding properties, but there are no conjectural features or elements that give a "false sense of history" (Renovation to earlier historic style of property is acceptable if based on documentary evidence)  |

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(17) <b><u>Details</u></b> New additions are appropriate to styles found within the HPZ, while avoiding a false sense of historical development such as by adding conjectural features from other buildings
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(18) <b><u>Reversibility</u></b> New additions, if removed in the future, leave the essential form and integrity of the property and its environment unimpaired
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(19) <b><u>Landscaping</u></b> Plantings and ornamental features reflect the historic period of subject structure (may only be considered as part of a required HPZ review)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(20) <b><u>Enclosures</u></b> Fences, walls, or other physical features are compatible with architectural style of subject structure and contributing properties within the development zone
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(21) <b><u>Utilities</u></b> New above ground power and telephone lines and utility connections are appropriately located
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(22) <b><u>Motor Vehicle &amp; Parking Areas</u></b> (a) Off-site parking spaces for uses within HPZ are not more than 600 feet away (b) New and modified vehicular use areas are landscaped and screened using compatible structural and plant materials

**Proposed ADU:**

Historic Preservation staff find that the proposed work for the new ADU conforms with preservation standards.

<b>New Construction &amp; Non-Contributing Property Modifications (UDC 5.8, TSM 9-02.7.0, SOI Standards, HPZ Design Guidelines)</b>			
S	D	NA	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1) <b><u>General</u></b> Compatible with contributing properties within the HPZ (new construction is not mistaken for an original historic building)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2) <b><u>Height</u></b> Height generally conforms to typical height within development zone; new buildings are no higher than the tallest contributor of the same use in the development zone (e.g. principal buildings are compared to principal buildings, accessory structures are compared to accessory structures except for Accessory Dwelling Units, which are compared to primary buildings); and height of new buildings are compatible with the height of neighboring contributing historic properties.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3) <b><u>Roof Types</u></b> Roof is compatible in configuration, mass, and materials to the prevailing style and period of existing structures within the development zone
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(4) <b><u>Setbacks</u></b> Maintains prevailing street and interior perimeter yard setbacks within its development zone
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5) <b><u>Site Utilization</u></b> Spacing between building is consistent with that of contributors within the development zone

- |                                     |                          |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (6) <b><u>Building Form</u></b><br>Size, scale and mass of additions are compatible with contributors within the development zone  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (7) <b><u>Proportion</u></b><br>Consistent with prevailing proportions of contributing properties within the development zone  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (8) <b><u>Projections and Recessions</u></b><br>Consistent with prevailing projections and recessions of contributing properties within the development zone   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (9) <b><u>Rhythm</u></b><br>Proportion, patterns and rhythm of openings, including at any additions, are compatible with those of contributors within development zone   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (10) <b><u>Windows &amp; Doors</u></b><br>The size, shape, and materials of window and door openings are compatible with those of contributors within the development zone                                       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (11) <b><u>Materials</u></b><br>All construction materials are appropriate to the HPZ  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (12) <b><u>Surface Textures</u></b><br>Appropriate to historical style of the HPZ  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (13) <b><u>Colors</u></b><br>Appropriate to the HPZ (May only be considered as part of a required HPZ review)  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (14) <b><u>Architectural Style</u></b><br>New construction is compatible with surrounding properties, but there are no conjectural features or "false sense of history"  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (15) <b><u>Details</u></b><br>New construction is appropriate to styles found within the HPZ, while avoiding a false sense of historical development such as by adding conjectural features from other buildings |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (16) <b><u>Landscaping</u></b><br>Plantings and ornamental features reflect the historic period of the HPZ (may only be considered as part of a required HPZ review)   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (17) <b><u>Enclosures</u></b><br>Fences, walls, or other physical features are compatible with architectural style of contributing properties within the development zone  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | (18) <b><u>Utilities</u></b><br>New above ground power and telephone lines and utility connections are appropriate   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (19) <b><u>Motor Vehicle &amp; Parking Areas</u></b><br>(a) Off-site parking spaces for uses within HPZ are not more than 600 feet away  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (20) (b) New and modified vehicular use areas are landscaped and screened using compatible structural and plant materials  |

## REQUESTED ACTION

The Department seeks a recommendation whether to approve, approve of the conditions, or deny the proposed project.



West University Historic Zone Advisory Board  
Tuesday, February 10, 2026, at 6:00PM  
Virtual Meeting  
**Meeting Minutes/Legal Action Report**

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Meeting was called to order at 6:01 pm.

**Board Members in Attendance:** R. McDonnell, J. Glock, L. Spetnagle, and G. Stoner,

**Board Members Absent/Excused:** None

**Staff in Attendance:** M. Taku and D. Aranda (Planning and Development Services Department [PDSD])

**Guests in Attendance:** Alex Enoch, Rachel Serra, Shawn Burke, Russ Jones, Sara Fox, Ross Valenzuela and Rusk Paul (Prospective Board Member)

**2. Review and approval of the Legal Action Report/Minutes (LAR) for the Meetings of December 09, 2025. Action**

**Motion:** G. Stoner moved to approve the Legal Action Report/Minutes for the meeting of December 09, 2025, as submitted.

The motion was seconded by J. Glock.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 4-0.

**3. Call to Audience**

None.

**4. Reviews**

**a. SD-0723-00076/TC-RES-0825-04240 Action  
925 N Jacobus Avenue (formerly 818 E Speedway)**

This is a request to revise a previously approved design package. Revised plans would include replacing existing damaged wood siding at north, south, and west facades with stucco to match that of the existing house. The wood siding is not salvageable due to severe water damage. Stucco joints would be utilized and placed to define areas where new stucco meets new. Windows along the north (secondary) façade would be replaced and non-original window openings would be modified. A revision to the plan for the east façade is also proposed. Instead of removing the original

second entry door as previously approved, the applicant proposes to retain the original entry and repair/restore it.

*Full Review/Contributing Resource*

*Staff Contact: Michael Taku, Historic Preservation Lead Planner*

Staff Aranda introduced the project and summarized the actionable items before the board for action. Ross Valenzuela from Core Construction presented an overview of the project, clarified points and answered questions. Discussion was held on the proposed revisions to previously approved design package.

Action was taken.

**Motion 1:** J. Glock motions to recommend approval of the proposed roof shingles and color as presented.

The motion was seconded by L. Spetnagle.

No discussion.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 4-0.

Further discuss on the replacement and potential removal of windows, the restoration or not of a sleeping porch, and the debate on whether the north door on the east side is original or not, the board decided the best course of action was for a site visit. Terms of reference: meet in person at 925 N Jacobus to review and discuss the plans for the north and west elevation windows, the west elevation stucco, and the east elevation door. Members need to see the property in its current state in person before any final recommendations can be made.

**Motion 2:** R. McDonnell motions to continue the review to provide an opportunity for the board to do an on-site review.

The motion was seconded by L. Spetnagle.

No discussion.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 4-0.

**b. SD-0725-00102/TC-RES-0325-01651/CE-VIO0325-010145 Action  
605 E 4<sup>th</sup> Street/710 N 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue (Parcel #117033640)**

The review is to comply with a pending Code Violation for repairs to the duplexes (Unit 1, 605 E 4th Street and Unit 2, 710 N 2nd Avenue). The applicant replaced all windows with vinyl sliding windows and altered the window opening sizes, staircase on the back patio, and wood fencing without prior historic review and approval. Stucco repair and exterior painting were also carried out and are part of this review.

The applicant is also proposing to demolish an existing garage and construct a new one-story 787 SF Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) at the rear of the property. The proposed ADU will require setback waivers on the east and north property boundaries.

*Full Review/Contributing Resource*

*Staff Contact: Michael Taku, Historic Preservation Lead Planner*

Staff Taku introduced the project and summarized the actionable items before the board for action. First, Zoning violation on Unit #2 (710 N 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue): window opening sizes altered and vinyl sliders installed. Second, proposed rehabilitation on Unit#1 (605 E 4<sup>th</sup> Street): stucco repair, stair repair/replacement, and fence repair. Third, proposed ADU. Finally, demolition of a metal garage.

Project designer, Alex Enoch and Russ Jones (Carasta Construction, LLC) presented an overview of the project, clarified points and answered questions.

Discussion was held.

Action was taken.

**Motion 1:** J. Glock motions to continue the zoning violation and proposed rehabilitation reviews to provide an opportunity for the applicant to return with proposal for compliant windows. Clad hung windows are acceptable per guidelines. All other exterior changes should be proposed as well to include stairs, stucco, and fence.

The motion was seconded by L. Spetnagle.

No discussion.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 4-0.

Discussion moved to the ADU. Given that the violation has not been resolved, this ADU discussion was just a courtesy review allowing board members to comment.

No motions regarding the ADU.

**Motion 2:** McDonnell moves to recommend approval of the demolition of the non-contributing metal garage. Applicant submits minor architectural documentation of the demolished garage.

The motion was seconded by L. Spetnagle.

No discussion.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 4-0.

c. TP-PRE-0226-00031

Courtesy

**614 N 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue (Parcel # 117071200)**

This is an informational presentation for feedback on a proposed rehabilitation of an existing 595 SF contributing main house and a proposed 859 SF addition. The applicant also proposes demolition of an existing rear porch and construction of a breezeway between the new addition and the main house along the east property line.

*Courtesy Review/Contributing Resource*

*Staff Contact: Michael Taku, Historic Preservation Lead Planner*

Staff Taku introduced the project and summarized the expectations of board for courtesy reviews.

Project architect, Rachel Serra, presented an overview of the project, clarified points and answered questions.

The Board asked questions and offered the following comments:

- There were discussion and support for the breezeway concept.
- Question about how to connect breezeway to the main house to clearly distinguish between new and old. No sense of false history to be avoided.
- Concerns about windows looking like sliders.
- Recommend all openings to be restored.
- Concerns the new addition may hamper the existing tree.
- Board supports the porch demo as a health and safety concern.
- Discussion on good preservation being repair, repair, repair before replacement and/or demolition.
- Discussion on roofline integration into the new addition.
- Need to show the relationship between the buildings.

No action taken was taken as the item was a Courtesy Review

**5. Staff Updates**

**Information Only**

- Staff Taku informs the board that he will be on vacation and will not facilitate the March and April 2026 review meetings.
- Staff Taku summarizes minor reviews conducted. Informed the board that the roof violation at 145 E University is to be abated by removing the corrugated roof material and replacement with appropriate roof material according to Design Guidelines. A request from the board to add minor reviews as an agenda item.
- J. Glock announced that WUNA allocated money for WUHZAB. That will assist in the graphic design of the Guidelines.
- Chair McDonnell announced potential new WUHZAB members-Cece Chavez, Christopher Domin, Hailey Sablosky and Paul Rusk.

**6. Future Agenda Items**

**Information Only**

Staff Taku noted continued cases will be on the agenda if properly submitted by deadlines. The next regularly scheduled date is March 10, 2026.

**7. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

-Rick McDonnell (Acting Secretary)