

HPC

Monroe County Historic Preservation Commission MINUTES

Monday, March 2, 2026

2:00 PM Regular Meeting:



Call to Order.

Roll Call.

Present and answering the roll call:

Chair Brian Shea,

Commissioner Erica Poole,

Commissioner Leslie Calero,

Commissioner Brad Bertelli.

Commissioner Kate DeLoach attended via zoom (cannot vote)

Staff present: Derek Howard, Assistant County Attorney

Thomas Francis-Siburg, Acting Planning and Development Review Manager

Adoption of the Minutes from the meeting on February 23, 2026.

Erica Poole motioned to approve the minutes for the meeting held on February 23, 2026. Brad Bertelli seconded the motion. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

Changes to the Agenda.

No changes to the agenda.

Application for Special Certificate of Appropriateness

1. SATCH! LLC (FILE NO. 2026-016) IS SEEKING APPROVAL TO REPLACE FIFTEEN (15) EXISTING WINDOWS AND TWO (2) EXISTING DOORS WITH FIFTEEN (15) IMPACT RATED WINDOWS AND TWO (2) IMPACT RATED DOORS ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 149 SUNRISE DRIVE, WITHIN THE TAVERNIER HISTORIC DISTRICT, HAVING PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 00506460-000000 AND DESCRIBED AS LOT 13, KNUST AND LANE RESUBDIVISION, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 1, PAGE 146, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

Staff presentation and recommendation

Thomas Francis Siburg provided history and architecture of the building, 149 Sunrise Drive is a contributing single-family home built in 1948 as identified in the Monroe County property appraiser records. The existing windows of the building are jalousie windows.

Mr. Francis Siburg read the staff report noting the applicable standards and guidelines.

From the Secretary of Interior Standards, Rehabilitation, page 76, Standard 2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

Mr. Francis Siburg stated, the applicant will maintain the existing historically aesthetic storm shutters with the new impact rated windows and doors.

Mr. Francis Siburg stated, no issues noted.

Standard 3, each property shall 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 architectural elements from other buildings shall not be undertaken.

Mr. Francis Siburg stated, the existing single-family residential use and building will be maintained, and the applicant will maintain the existing historically aesthetic storm shutters with the new impact-rated windows and doors.

Mr. Francis Siburg stated, no issues noted.

Standard 5, distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques are examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

Mr. Francis Siburg stated, the existing home contains distinctive storm shutter features. The applicant will maintain these distinctive and historically aesthetic storm shutters with the new impact rated windows and doors.

Mr. Francis Siburg stated, no issues noted.

Standard eight, archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

Mr. Francis Siburg stated there are no known archaeological resources on the property.

Mr. Francis Siburg stated, no issues noted.

Standard 9, new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Mr. Francis Siburg stated, no issues noted.

From the Tavernier Historic District Preservation guidelines, building elements and materials, doors, page 25. The intent is to have doors that are compatible with the character of the district, contributing structures. Doors should be maintained and repaired before considering replacement. If a historic door needs to be replaced, the new one should be built to match the original one and should be installed with matching head and jam details. Doors should be hinged, pivot or sliding doors are not acceptable. Acceptable methods of construction include wood panel doors made of horizontal rails and vertical styles that frame one or more panels and single pane French doors, batten or flush doors are not acceptable, nor are flush doors that stimulate panel doors. Screen doors hinged on front of the primary door are acceptable.

Mr. Francis Siburg stated, the plans propose replacing the existing doors with impact rated glass doors. The Commission may wish to discuss the proposed glass doors for compatibility.

Windows, page 26, the intent is to have windows that are compatible with the character of the districts contributing structures. Windows should be maintained and repaired before considering replacement. If a historic window needs to be replaced, the window should be built to match the original one and should be installed matching head, sill, and jam details. Window types can be casement, single hung, or double hung. Jalousie or awning windows may be acceptable in appropriate historic buildings if they are original. Pivot, fixed, or picture and a horizontal slider window are not acceptable. Window glazing should be clear and non-reflective and aluminum windows are not allowed.

Mr. Francis Siburg stated, the plans propose replacing the existing aluminum jalousie windows with aluminum impact-rated single-hung encasement made of aluminum.

Mr. Francis Siburg suggested, the Commission may wish to discuss the proposed aluminum impact rated windows for compatibility.

Shutters, pages 26 and 27, the intent is to maintain the character of the district by allowing typical shutter types, contributing structures, retain existing shutters. Two types of shutters are encouraged, top hinge and side hinge shutters.

Mr. Francis Siburg stated, the plans propose maintaining and retaining the existing top hinge storm shutters, no issues noted.

Staff recommended that if the Commission chooses to grant a special certificate of appropriateness, the Commission should consider the following conditions of approval: 1) the special certificate of Appropriateness is based on the design and placement of the proposed windows and doors as shown on the floor plan sketch and window and door plan submitted as part of this request. 2) work not specified may not be carried out without an additional special certificate of appropriateness or regular certificate of appropriateness approval. This special certificate of appropriateness is only for the aforesaid project and does not waive the required approvals for any future structures, modifications, or additions. 3) the applicant shall apply for and receive a building permit for the aforesaid work. The special certificate of appropriateness does not discharge exempt or otherwise release the applicant or his/ her heirs, assigns, or successors in title from his/her duty to comply with any additional requirements based upon the Florida building code and/or floodplain design requirements. 4) the proposed scope of work has not been reviewed for compliance with the Monroe County Planning and Environmental Resources Department prior to the issuance of building permits, new developments, modifications and structures shall be found in compliance with Monroe County Comprehensive Plan and the Monroe County Land Development Code.

Applicant presentation

Krissy Bohnstedt, the agent for the applicant stated, the one concern that the planner pointed out to me was the fact that the windows were aluminum. Ms. Bohnstedt stated, she took additional pictures of the existing windows so that the Commission can see that the windows being replaced are aluminum for aluminum, with difference being the impact.

Public testimony

There was no public input.

Board discussion

Commissioner Brad Bertelli asked if there are pictures of the glass doors.

Ms. Bohnstedt stated she provided just the NOAs on the windows and doors that are to be installed.

Commissioner Erica Poole stated, the NOA would provide whether or not the window is single light, it doesn't provide whether or not it's divided light or double light or anything because it's only based on the impact rating of the specific door. The NOA would not specify how much glass. It's going to just specify that there is glass. Ms. Poole stated, divided lights don't change the impact rating of the glass if they're superficial.

Mr. Bertelli stated his concern would be that the former door is wood and trying to keep in the theme of that in the historic district. Will it be a full glass door that would make it look completely different.

Mr. Shea stated the requirement says the window should be maintained or repaired before considering replacements and would like to know the reason behind replacing the windows and doors.

Ms. Bohnstedt stated the reason behind replacement to impact windows is for the safety of the structure. Ms. Bohnstedt stated the owner is going to leave the storm shutters for the character that was discussed in the opening presentation. The way the shutters are, it's actually very hard to see the windows unless you go up close and look under. Ms. Bohnstedt stated she does not think the cranks work at all to open or close the windows, since they are pretty old and the property owners just want to upgrade before hurricane season.

Ms. Poole stated she has zero concern with the jalousie windows being replaced.

Mr. Bertelli agreed with Ms. Poole.

Mr. Bertelli asked if it was an issue for the windows to be aluminum if aluminum is not allowed?

Ms. Poole stated no.

Mr. Shea stated the reason behind that was that there are a lot of wood windows, and so we didn't want to switch from wood to having aluminum windows by the fact that there is already aluminum in the glass. Mr. Shea stated he feels that it is at least compatible.

Mr. Shea welcomed the property owner in attendance via zoom and stated that Commission had questions about the style and type of door that she is looking to put in.

Chelsea Harris, the property owner, stated that she does not have the details of it, but she can do whatever the Commissioners will allow. Mrs. Harris stated she is just trying to come up with a hurricane grade impact door which is what the window company had quoted, but that she can get with the window company and just follow whatever the Commissioners recommendations are. Mrs. Harris stated she was going to go with something that went with the windows.

Mr. Shea asked if Mrs. Harris can explain what her current door is.

Mrs Harris stated right now, it is just a wood door with a kind of a half-circle, window pattern on the

top of it. It is a basic gray door. Mrs. Harris stated the back door is full windows.

Ms. Poole asked the property owner if she would be amenable to adding divided lights to the existing exterior doors that face the street? Ms. Poole explained the divided lines are little grills that are kind of superficial. Ms. Poole stated they do not modify your impact rating or anything. It just makes it look like it's multiple panes of glass, when there actually are none.

Mrs. Harris stated possibly yes, and stated if it matches the windows.

Mrs. Poole stated, the same manufacturer can make the same thing and confirm that she is addressing the doors.

Mrs. Harris stated, if it is required then yes. She stated she was just trying to come up with something that would go with the windows, so if the windows didn't have that on there, then she would prefer the door did not either.

Mr. Bertellis confirmed the jalousie windows will be replaced and are not the issue and stated the commissioners are referring to the doors.

Mrs. Harris stated the doors do not technically face the street, but can be seen from the street and asked if that is what the commissioners are referring to.

The commissioners confirmed that is what they are referring to.

Mrs. Harris confirmed she can do that.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, he believes both doors are facing internally to the property and are not visible from the street. He believes that is what the property owner is referencing, and believes that is what he reviewed as well.

Ms. Poole stated she was fine with any windows and doors that are anywhere throughout the property being changed the way they are proposed. But if any of the windows that were facing the street were to be changed to doors, she would recommend that they have divided lights in them. Ms. Poole stated that was her main concern, if anything, facing the front yard became a door she believes it should have divided lights, but being that all the doors proposed on the plan are all interior to the property, she does not have an issue with it.

Ms. Poole confirmed that she has no issues with the jalousie windows being replaced aluminum to aluminum.

Mr. Shea made a motion to approve with staff's recommendations and added the condition of windows and doors as per the approved plans. Mr. Bertellis second the motion. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

Application for Special Certificate of Appropriateness

2. GONZALEZ FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST 06/05/2017 (FILE NO. 2026-017) IS SEEKING APPROVAL TO DEMOLISH AND CONSTRUCT A NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE AT 154 OCEAN VIEW DRIVE, WITHIN THE TAVERNIER HISTORIC DISTRICT, HAVING PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 00555280-000000 AND DESCRIBED AS LOT 1 AND PART OF LOT 2, BLOCK 2, AND ADJACENT BAY BOTTOM, TAVERNIER HEIGHTS, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 1, PAGE 180, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

Staff presentation and recommendation

Mr. Francis-Siburg provided history and architecture of the building, 154 Ocean View Drive is a non-contributing single-family home built in 1974 as identified in Monroe County Property Appraiser records.

From the Secretary of the Interior Standards Rehabilitation, page 76 Standard 8 archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place if such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated there are no known archaeological resources on the property, no issues noted.

Standard 9 new additions, exterior alterations or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, there are no known historic materials or features on the property or structure, no issues noted.

From the Tavernier Historic District Preservation guidelines, site development, setbacks page 19, new buildings. New buildings have to comply with the ordinance and will be individually reviewed to ensure that their placement does not dominate or obscure a historic structure. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated the property does not contain any historic structures, no issues noted.

Parking page 19, the intent of these parking provisions is to lessen the effect of parked vehicles and the requirement to provide parking for vehicles in the historic district where the current parking requirements were not part of the development pattern. New buildings, up to 100% of the parking requirement may be waived if considered appropriate after review. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated the plan's proposed parking under the new house and propose a driveway in front of the house, no issues noted.

Fences, page 20, the intent is to maintain the small community ambiance by encouraging the placement of white picket fences in the district, although this is not a requirement. Should a front fence be used, a picket fence with flat wood boards no taller than 4 feet high and painted white is the most appropriate for the district. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated the plans propose a picket fence, however the color and height of the fence are not provided. Additionally, the plans propose an oolite limestone landscape wall to the northwest of the new house near the intersections of Ocean View Drive and Tarpon Street. The Commission may wish to discuss the picket fence color, height and the oolite limestone wall.

Build-in configuration, height, page 20, the intent is to maintain the scale of the district by assessing the height of new buildings in relation to the adjacent historic buildings. New buildings, new buildings will be reviewed to ensure that the height is appropriate and does not obscure or adversely impact the historic scale of the historic district. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated the plans proposed an elevated structure

with a ground floor storage and parking area and two stories over the ground floor, with a total elevation of 44.87 feet NGVD 29 total height, 38 feet measured from crown of road. The neighboring property across Ocean View Drive with address 248 Tarpon Street has a similar height as is proposed, with two stories elevated over a ground level parking storage. Immediate neighboring property with address 236 Tarpon Street consists of an elevated one and a half stories over a ground-level parking storage area. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, no issues noted.

Building base height, page 22, new buildings will be monitored to ensure that the building base heights greater than the historic elevation are not detrimental to the district's character. In general, new buildings should be maintained at the minimum floor flood level and not above, if possible, and subject to design requirements for flooding due to hurricanes. Where possible, the addition of fill or sloping mounds to raise the structure to flood level is encouraged. New buildings, the building base height is to be reviewed within the context of surrounding structures. If a new building is adjacent to a contributing structure, the new building should be constructed at a minimum flood level. In the case of single-family residents, the first habitable floor should be at the minimum elevation required by FEMA requirements. When a new building's height is proposed above the historic base height, the space below the 1st habitable floor should be detailed so that the base of the building extends to the plane of the railings or wall above. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, the plans propose elevating the new single-family residence 3.5 feet above the required design flood elevation, resulting in a building base height of approximately 8.63 feet, measured from Crown of Road. Neighboring properties with addresses 248 Tarpon Street and 236 Tarpon Street appear to be similarly elevated. Fill is not proposed, but a large ground floor enclosure for parking and storage. The base of the building is proposed to extend to the plane of the railings and or walls above. Mr. Francis-Siburg suggested, the Commission may wish to discuss the proposed building base height exceeding the minimum required base height, and the lack of fill to elevate the structure, creating a large building base.

Roof shape, page 23, the intent is to direct new development to build roofs that are compatible with the character of the district. New buildings, new residential buildings should have sloped roofs. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, the plans propose a hipped roof design, no issues noted.

Porches, page 23, the intent is to encourage porches as a transition between the public and private realms. New buildings, porches should be compatible with the architecture of the historic district. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, the plans propose a double rear porch over a lanai, no issues noted.

Building elements and materials, roofing, page 24, the intent is to keep a uniformity of roofing materials in the district. Contributing structures, roofing materials, including standing seam metal, V-crimp, stamped metal, and composition tile. New buildings, new buildings should use the same materials most recently mentioned. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, the plans propose a metal roof, no issues noted.

Exterior walls, pages 24 to 25, the intent is to maintain uniformity of material for exterior walls in the district. New buildings, novelty siding, clapboard and board and batten are the recommended exterior wall materials, stucco and fiber cement siding may be acceptable, but will be reviewed on an individual basis. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, the plans proposed smooth stucco banding and cement board trims. Mr. Francis-Siburg suggested, the Commission may wish to discuss the compatibility of the building's exterior walls.

Building base, page 25, the intent is to have buildings with a defined base that is distinct from the rest of the building. New buildings, materials include diamond pattern or grin pattern lattice work and coral

stone. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, the plans proposed the same stucco banding as proposed for the rest of the exterior walls in the front and proposed an open base in the rear. Mr. Francis-Siburg suggested the Commission may wish to discuss the lack of a distinct building base and the lack of materials, including diamond pattern or grid pattern lattice or coral stone.

Doors, page 25, the intent is to have doors that are compatible with the character of the districts contributing structures, doors should be hinged. Pivot or sliding doors are not acceptable. Acceptable methods of construction include wood panel doors made of horizontal rails and vertical styles that frame one or more panels and single-pane French doors, batten or flush doors are not acceptable, nor are acceptable flush doors that simulate panel doors. Screen doors hinged on the front of the primary door are acceptable. New buildings, doors should be compatible with the character of the district. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated the plans appear to propose a mix of hinged and sliding doors. Mr. Francis-Siburg suggested the Commission may wish to discuss the compatibility of the proposed doors.

Windows, page 26, the intent is to have windows that are compatible with the character of the district. Contributing structures, window types can be encasement, single hung or double hung. Pivot, fixed or picture and horizontal slider windows are not acceptable. Window glazing should be clear and non-reflective and air vents may be allowed when the proportions are appropriate. Aluminum windows are not allowed. New buildings, windows should be compatible with the character of the district. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, the plans propose a mix of impact rated windows, including but not limited to picture windows and suggested the Commission may wish to discuss the compatibility of the proposed windows.

Shutters, pages 26 to 27, the intent is to maintain the character of the district by allowing typical shutter types. New buildings, shutters are allowed if they are compatible with the character of the district. Two types of shutters are encouraged such as top hinge style and side hinge shutters, other types of shutters, for example, accordion and roll down are permissible. Where possible, the shutters should be compatible with the character of the district. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, the plans proposed decorative shutters along second first living floor windows in the front of the house and no other shutters are proposed, no issues noted.

Color, page 28, it is preferable that historic colors be maintained with the body of a building white or a shade of color close to white. For shutters, a dark shade of green is recommended with the possible addition of white stripes, if desired. For porches, gray flooring with sky blue ceilings is recommended. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated the plans propose a house that is white or a shade of color close to white, no issues noted.

Landscaping a natural environment, page 28, the intent of this provision is to maintain the neighborhood tree cover and shade to maintain Tavernier as a distinctive community. Those trees which preserve the historic districts streetscape of the district are specifically protected. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, the plans propose one or more native canopy street trees, no issues noted.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated if the Commission chooses to grant a special certificate of appropriateness, staff recommends the Commission consider the following conditions of approval: 1) The special certificate of appropriateness is based on the plans by Sarah M. Girard signed and dated on January 15, 2026, submitted as part of this request. 2) Work not specified may not be carried out without an additional special certificate of appropriateness or regular certificate appropriateness approval. This special certificate of proprieness is only for the aforesaid project, it does not waive the required

approvals for any future structures, modifications, or additions. 3) The applicant shall apply for and receive a building permit for the aforesaid work, the special certificate of appropriateness does not discharge exempt or otherwise release the applicant or his/her heirs, assigns, or successors in title from his/her duty to comply with any additional requirements based upon the Florida building code and or floodplain design requirements. 4) The proposed scope of work has not been reviewed for compliance by the Monroe County Planning and Environmental Resources Department prior to the issuance of building permits, new development modifications and structures shall be found in compliance with Monroe County comprehensive plan and the Monroe County Land Development Code.

Applicant presentation

Present were Enrique Gonzalez, trustee of the Gonzalez Family Revocable Trust 06/05/2017 and Sarah Girard the agent for the applicant.

Ms. Girard the agent for the applicant stated the address for the property is 154 Ocean view drive but is actually on the corner of Ocean View Drive and Tarpon Street. Ms. Girard stated Ocean View Drive is kind of a dead ends on this property, and it faces Tarpon Street. The fence that she has proposed is more towards what she would consider the side yard and goes around the back, and it's really just for the safety of the pool. Ms. Girard stated, a 4-foot-high white picket fence is proposed but it may not have been called out on the plans. The intention behind the fence is to have some sort of landscape hedge hide the fence from that side. Ms. Girard stated the the oolite wall that was brought up was like a landscaped retaining wall that would hold a proposed three and a half feet of fill in order to slope the front of the house, which actually faces Tarpon Street. By doing this it could slope up a little bit and maintain the scale of the neighborhood with the number of stairs up to the front porch.

Ms. Girard stated, she was driving down the street and noticed there are not too many houses where the front yard really slopes significantly and felt like three and a half feet was sufficient. So, the landscape wall was just to sort of hold back the fill, because around on the other side would be the driveway into a proposed garage.

Ms. Girard stated the new single-family residence is 3.5 feet above the required design flood elevation, and the reason behind that, again, was to make the front piece of the structure more compatible with the with the neighborhood and allow more living space and a taller structure in the back that is sort of set back from the street just to give consideration to the neighborhood. In addition to that, the existing structure that is there, the first elevated floor is actually currently at 15 feet in NGVD, so we are really just proposing a floor height that is half a foot higher than where it is now. The structure that is there now is elevated, and it has a ground floor enclosure that was permitted pre-1974. There will be filter to grade the front yard, and if the commissioners feel like the height is too high, or there is not enough fill, that is something that we would be able to adjust if necessary or required.

Ms. Girard moved on to exterior walls and stated the plan for that front base is to be smooth stucco and then there was banding to sort of define the base. Then the two floor walls above that would be stucco lap siding and the trim around the windows would also be made out of stucco.

Ms. Girard stated she felt that the building base and materials were distinct, just because it is a different material from the two floors above, and then also sort of expressed with that banding between and again the plan is for landscaping to be in front of it.

Ms. Girard moved on to her notes regarding the doors and stated, she has hinged and sliding doors. The windows are casement and there are a couple of fixed windows that are decorative and there is

one in a location that is required by code.

Public testimony

There was no public input.

Staff response

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated his comments are limited to the lower-level enclosure.

Pursuant to Land Development Code (LDC) Section 131-2(b) as provided in policy 101.5.32, Buildings Voluntarily elevated to meet or exceed the FEMA base flood elevation BFE may exceed the 35-foot height limit as follows. (1) for NEW single family (detached dwelling unit) and multi-family (attached dwelling unit) buildings which are voluntarily elevated to exceed the building's minimum required BFE, an exception of a maximum of three (3) feet above the 35-foot height limit may be permitted. The amount of the height exception shall be no greater than the amount of voluntary elevation above BFE. In no event shall a new building exceed 38 feet in height or two (2) habitable floors. The space below the lowest habitable floor of an elevated structure shall be limited to a maximum of 299 square feet of enclosed floor area and shall be used exclusively for parking of vehicles, elevators, limited storage and/or building access purposes. This exception shall apply to the substantial improvement of buildings, whether voluntary or not.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated as provided in the code section in order to take advantage of the height exception, certain criteria must be met. Currently, the plan proposes a very large, much larger than 299 square-foot-enclosed area below the lowest habitable floor, i.e., a lower level enclosure. Currently code only allows houses to exceed the 35-foot height limit if the lower-level enclosure is no larger than 299 square feet. There is a pending ordinance being reviewed by the Board of County Commissioners to remove this limitation, but at this time, the timeline for review is uncertain and is definitely not effective. Planning staff will not be able to approve the proposed height or the proposed lower level enclosure as currently proposed at this time.

Mr. Francis Siburg suggested rather than require this project come back before the HPC with a revised plan, planning staff recommends the Commission consider a condition of approval, something to the effect of: approval to reduce and revise the lower level enclosure to up to 299 square feet and if the Monroe County Land Development Code is changed to allow a larger lower level enclosure, that the lower level enclosure be consistent with the proposed plan set and may come back for a revision at a future date without further HPC approval.

Applicant presentation

Ms. Girard stated she proposed moving forward with only enclosing the staircase and the elevator on the ground floor and leaving the lower level space open until the code is amended and at that time she could apply for a revision.

Mr. Gonzalez stated they are amenable to planning this proposal to reduce it to 299, as Sarah said, with the hope that if it does get amended by the county commission, that they can then take advantage. It would only be used to park the cars and golf cart.

Board discussion

Ms. Poole stated she has no concern with the oolite wall specifically for holding back fill so long as once it's exceeded, it's purpose of holding backfill, it changes to a picket if that is an option. The oolite

holding backfill is, in her opinion, historically relevant. The fill used to be held back by giant blocks of coral stone, and the closest thing you can get to it is oolite.

Ms. Poole clarified that she is suggesting the oolite wall be limited to a few inches and for retaining purposes and then switching to picket for any remaining height.

Ms. Girard stated it would just be a landscape wall and the intention is to hold back the fill.

Mr. Shea asked Ms. Girard to confirm, no additional fencing beyond the retaining wall, correct.

Ms. Girard confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Shea stated he is fine with it being as is as it is consistent with the other limestone features.

Ms. Poole provided Ms. Girard with an explanation regarding exceeding base height. If you are in an A zone, you have to go a foot above.

Mr. Shea stated you do have the fill along the front that does help with the massing and making it at least look similar to elsewhere in the district and it does drop down. The lomar looks like it is for the A zone.

Mr. Shea stated the question becomes, if the 299 lower-level enclosure does not change, does that front exterior wall remain or does that become a condition of the enclosure?

Ms. Girard stated she would still keep it remaining as it is because it is receiving some landscaping as its purpose.

Ms. Poole asked if the ground floor enclosure walls in the front be receiving the stucco lap, lattice detail, board and batten detail or solid stucco.

Ms. Girard confirmed it would receive solid stucco.

Mr. Francis-Siburg asked the chair to clarify if the applicant is proposing to keep the front wall that is being proposed, but just not as part of the enclosure.

Mr. Shea confirmed that is correct and for the Tarpon street side.

Ms. Girard stated she is not proposing lattice but instead privacy louvers on the side.

Ms. Poole stated she believes the use of horizontal lap up top and the smooth down below brings down the scale of the building a little bit. Instead of bringing the lap down to the ground floor, it should be kept 4 feet solid.

Mr. Shea stated the front door is not exactly compatible and it looks modern and should be compatible. Mr. Shea mentioned there are new Tavernier Historic Preservation District Guidelines that are under review but may provide great examples for the front door.

Ms. Poole suggested maybe a single door with side lights or something like that instead of something

more on the pivot realm is more amenable.

Ms. Girard stated they are open to the suggestion.

Ms. Poole restated the front door is currently proposed as a big pivot door and suggested that instead the applicant do something where it is a door with single or double side lights.

Mr. Gonzalez agreed that he is fine with changing it from a pivot door to a hinged door that is half solid on the bottom and glass on top and he is amenable to making that change.

Mr. Shea stated there are examples of the doors on page thirty of the updated guidelines.

Ms. Poole suggested another option is a full light door with divided lights and stated if Mr. Gonzalez wanted the full glass height, having divided lights also gives it the look of a French door. It is not modern but it gives that full glass, the full amount of sunlight.

Mr. Gonzalez stated he would like to maintain consistency with the windows around the house, which will not have any divided light. The windows will all be solid glass. That is why he was thinking half glass on top, half solid on the bottom.

Ms. Poole mentioned she did not see any picture windows on the elevation besides the round windows and asked Ms. Girard if that was correct.

Ms. Girard stated that is correct except she believes there is one fixed window on the side for the generator.

Mr. Shea stated he noticed something while looking at the windows and asked if picket railing is proposed in the front, but then appears the railing is different railing elsewhere.

Ms. Girard stated that was correct.

Mr. Shea asked what the proposed railing elsewhere is.

Ms. Girard stated cable railing would be located elsewhere and that it has not been completely selected.

Mr. Shea stated he would lean more towards having the railing be consistent throughout to match the front and not having the cable railings.

Mr. Bertelli agreed.

Ms. Girard stated they were amenable to not having the cable railings in the front because you would see it from the street.

Mr. Shea stated that the property has two frontages.

Ms. Girard asked if there was any way around that requirement as with the landscaping that is being proposed the railing would not be visible driving down Tarpon Street, which there is only one house across the street on Ocean View.

Ms. Poole stated she really would stick with a vertical picket instead of horizontal picket or cable throughout.

Ms. Shea agreed and stated it would be consistent.

Mr. Gonzalez stated keeping in mind that the house actually faces tarpon even though it has an address that says ocean there is only the street that is a dead end right into the ocean. He wanted to make sure the property had the historic look of Tavernier on the front side of the house. The backside of the house is only visible from the ocean and is not visible from the side. Mr. Gonzalez stated the only thing he is asking for after the money he has spent to build the house and to purchase it was to have unobstructed views to the beautiful ocean view. The property would be his retirement home and with the picket he would have an obstructed view across the entire back as opposed to what he is proposing. Mr. Gonzalez stated there is one terrace on the side of the house that faces the ocean that he would include picket. Mr. Gonzalez asked the Commissioners if he could have the back of the house to be able to look out to the ocean and added as he gets older he does not want to worry about the maintenance of the picket along the back. Mr. Gonzalez referenced the home now does not have a picket and instead it has some kind of wood and it is all falling apart.

Ms. Poole clarified that the Commissioners are not stating that it has to be a wood picket but rather they are suggesting a vertical style instead of a horizontal style.

Mr. Gonzalez stated his issue is his ability to enjoy his view. If he is sitting in a chair at no height for safety reasons, because of how high the picket is going to have to be, he would not be able to enjoy it. Mr. Gonzalez stated he respectfully ask for the Commissioners consideration regarding the requirements on the back of the home as he has previously agreed to all of the commissioners suggestions.

Mr. Shea asked if there are also shutters proposed only on the first floor on Tarpon Street.

Ms. Girard confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Shea asked if there was any reason behind not having shutters on the additional second floor or on the side street?

Ms. Girard stated no.

Mr. Shea made a motion to approve with the standard conditions 1 through 4 that are already in the staff report and the standard recommendation for conditions. Ms. Poole seconded the motion. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Poole made a motion to approve the oolite wall being solely used for landscape retaining plus a few inches, and then above that finishing with picket based on the fence code with the Planning Department if applicable. Mr. Shea seconded the motion. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Shea made a motion to approve the base height, compatibility of the wall materials, and maintaining the front wall even if the 299 lower-level enclosure is not approved at the county level with regular

stucco and no details on that lower portion. Mr. Bertelli seconded the motion. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Shea made a motion to change the door to be consistent with the guidelines with the potential for the lights on the side. Mr. Bertelli seconded the motion. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Calero made a motion to approve the windows. Ms. Poole seconded the motion. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Poole made a motion to approve the railings as proposed on any visible sides from a street being horizontal and any non-visible from the street on a different plane being horizontal or they can all be picket. No cable.

Mr. Bertelli made a motion to approve the railing with vertical picket on the North and West and horizontal picket on the East and South or vertical picket all throughout. Ms. Poole seconded the motion. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Shea made a motion to approve the height and color of the picket that is proposed along the perimeter of the property as a picket that is not taller than four (4) feet high and painted white as appropriate within the district for the public facing. Mr. Bertelli seconded the motion. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bertelli amended his motion to adopt the fence. Mr. Shea seconded the amendment. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

Application for Special Certificate of Appropriateness

LOWE HOUSE CORPORATION (FILE NO. 2026-027) IS SEEKING APPROVAL TO REPLACE AN EXISTING METAL SHINGLE ROOF WITH A 5-V CRIMP METAL PANEL ROOF AT 91770 OVERSEAS HIGHWAY, TAVERNIER, HAVING PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 00090180-000000 AND DESCRIBED AS A PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED IN SECTION 34, TOWNSHIP 62 SOUTH, RANGE 38 EAST, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

Staff presentation and recommendation

Mr. Francis-Siburg provided history and architecture of the building stating that the Lowe House was designated a historic and cultural landmark, per the Monroe County Board of County Commissioners Resolution No. 449-1997. The Lowe House was built in 1944 and is located in Tavernier, however, outside of the Tavernier Historic District.

From the Secretary of the Interior Standards Rehabilitation, page 76, Standard 2, the historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved, the removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided. The property contains a metal shingle roof; and it is proposed to be replaced with a metal V-crimp panel roof. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated that the Commission may wish to discuss the character of the existing and proposed metal roofing.

Standard 5, distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques are examples of craftsmanship

that characterize a property shall be preserved. Staff comment. The property contains a metal shingle roofing, and it is proposed to be replaced with a V-crimp metal panel roofing.

Staff Comment: There are no archaeological resources on the property. No issues.

Standard 9, the additions, exterior alterations or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Staff Comment: The request proposes exterior alterations to the historic and cultural landmark. The Commission may wish to discuss whether the proposed roof impacts the historic materials, features, and spatial relationship that characterize the property recommendation.

Staff Recommendation:

If the Commission chooses to grant a special certificate of appropriateness, staff recommends the Commission consider the following conditions of approval. One (1), the special certificate of appropriateness is based on NOA number 22-0907.05 with expiration date 04-11-2029, as submitted as part of this request; Two (2), work not specified may not be carried out without an additional certificate of appropriateness or regular certificate of appropriateness approval. This special certificate of appropriateness is only for the aforesaid project. It does not weigh the required approvals for any future structures, modifications, or additions; Three (3) the applicant shall apply for and receive a building permit for the aforesaid work, the special certificate of appropriateness does not discharge exempt or otherwise release the applicant or his her heirs, assigns, or successors in title from his or her duty to comply with any additional requirements based upon the Florida building code and or floodplain design requirements; and Four (4) The proposed scope of work has not been reviewed for compliance with by the Monroe County Planning and Environmental Resources Department. Prior to the issuance of the building permits, new development modifications and structures shall be found in compliance with Monroe County Comprehensive Plan and the Monroe County Land Development Code.

Applicant presentation

The applicant was not in attendance.

Public testimony

There was no public input.

Board Discussion

Ms. Erica Poole stated that it's a hard sell for her to take a historic and cultural landmark and change its entire roofing material profile. Ms. Poole stated that Shingle is disappearing and this property is already an individually registered property. Mr. Shea agreed and stated that they do make similar products. Ms. Poole stated that they make 180 mile rated shingle. Ms. Poole stated that this is not a code or a wind rated issue, but rather a style issue. The structure is lower and the roof is visible, therefore it should stay shingle. Mr. Bertelli agreed and stated that it is important to protect what is left in the community.

Mr. Shea stated that he would entertain a motion to amend staff's recommendation to change number one (1). Ms. Poole made a motion to approve based on modifying recommendation one (1) that the NOA and roofing material be replaced with a code compliant metal shingle roof. Mr. Shea seconded

the motion. There were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

4. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE SUBMITTAL OF AN ANNUAL REPORT TO THE MONROE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS (BOCC) DETAILING THE ACTIONS OF THE MONROE COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION DURING THE PRIOR YEAR (2025) AND THE CURRENT STATE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA OF THE COUNTY, IN ACCORDANCE WITH MONROE COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE SECTION 135-3(g)(13).

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated that this is a unique item. There has not been an annual report recently from the HPC, but this is a proposed annual report to the BOCC.

SECTION I: Introduction

Pursuant to Monroe County Land Development Code LDC Section 135-3, subsection G. The Historic Preservation Commission HPC or Commission possesses certain powers and duties, which include subsection 13; Provide an annual report to the BOCC detailing the actions of the HPC during the prior year and the current state of historic preservation in the unincorporated area of the county.

Herein after is a reporting of the 2025 calendar year and current state of historic preservation in unincorporated Monroe County.

SECTION II: Key Facts

Members: Pursuant to LDC Section 135-3, Subsection B, the HBC consists of five members appointed by the Monroe County Board of County Commissioners. Each member shall be a resident of the county at the time of the appointment and during his term in office.

Two HPC members resigned, and two new replacement members were added. The Commission currently consists of Brian Shea, Chair, Urban Regional Planner; Kate Deloach, Vice Chair Layman; Brad Bertelli, Member, Historian; Erica Poole, Member, Architect, and Leslie Calero, Member Art and Antiquities Expert.

Staff: Pursuant to LDC Section 135-3(d), the planning director shall designate staff to advise and provide clerical support to the HBC and pursuant to LDC section 135-10 (a), the BOCC may enter into an agreement with the Historic Florida Keys Foundation assigning to the foundation some or all the duties of the planning director under this article. For most of 2025, the BOCC previously had an agreement with the foundation to review HPC agenda items for compliance with local, state, and federal historic and preservation regulations. The Executive Director of the foundation, Diane Silvia, acted as the HPC coordinator, planning staff provided administrative and clerical support to the HPC and the foundation and a planning department staff member was assigned as a liaison to the HBCU to provide guidance to the HPC with regards to other land development regulations which may impact items under review by the Commission. The agreement with the foundation ended on September 30th, 2025. From October 1, 2025 through the end of the calendar year, HPC staff included Stephanie Reed, Senior Planner, Planning Liaison, and new HPC coordinator; Melanie Cabanas, Planning Technician, Vacation Rental Coordinator, new HPC Administrator, and Derek Howard, Senior Assistant County Attorney, HPC Legal Counsel.

Professional Training: Brian Shea, Chair, presenter at the 16th Annual Southeast Florida Climate Leadership Summit, December 2024; Stephanie Reed, Senior Planner, CLG training; Pinellas County Historic Resources Dashboard webinar, October 29, 2025. Diane Sylvia, former preservationist, former with the with the HPC. Preservationist heritage Monitoring Scout Scouts, Florida Public Archaeology Network for 2025. Tidally United Summit 2025 Florida Public Archaeology Network 731-2025, Collaborating for Community Preservation Nonprofits and commissions, Division of Historical Resources 814-2025.

Meetings: Pursuant to LDC section 135-3(d), the HPC shall meet at least six times during a calendar year. There were 7 HPC meetings held in 2025.

Certified local government (CLG): Pursuant to LDC. Section 135-3(g)(14), the HPC has the power and duty to assist county staff in monitoring county certification from the State Historic Preservation officer as a certified local government or CLG. The CLG program was enacted as part of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980, and links federal, state, and local governments into a preservation partnership for the identification, evaluation, and protection of historic properties. In coordination with the HPC, staff submitted the 2024-2025 certified local government annual report to the Florida Department of State, Bureau of Historic Preservation, also known as Bureau, on November 3rd of 2025. Monroe County received a letter from the Bureau dated December 16, 2025, confirming the receipt of the CLG Annual Report and the county status being in good standing.

Grants: Pursuant to LDC section 135-3(g)(12), the HPC has the power and duty to identify, and recommend to the BOCC sources for grant assistance from State, Federal and private sources, for the purpose of historic preservation. There were no grants applied for in 2025.

Text amendments: Pursuant to LDC section 135-3(g)(7), the HPC has the power and duty to recommend land development regulations, comprehensive plan amendments, and municipal code amendments to the Planning Director to assist in the preservation of historic properties to the extent such that they are not inconsistent with the Land Development Code, the comprehensive plan, or state laws. There were no text amendments recommended by the Planning Director in 2025.

Rules of Procedures: Pursuant to LDC Section 135-3(g)(1) the HPC has the power and a duty to adopt and amend rules of procedure. To the extent that they are not inconsistent with the Land Development Code, the comprehensive plan, or state laws. There were no amendments to the Rules of Procedures in 2025.

Florida Master Site File: Pursuant to LDC Section 135-3(g)(10), the HPC has the power and duty to identify historical buildings, sites, structures, objects, and archaeological sites in the unincorporated area of the county, which may become part of the Florida master's file. The Florida master site file is the State of Florida's official inventory of historical and cultural resources, including archaeological sites, historical structures, historical cemeteries, historical bridges, and historical districts, landscapes, and linear features. The total number of three (3) sites were inventoried in unincorporated Monroe County in 2025 added by Historic Florida Keys Foundation. All three (3) sites were located on Crane Boulevard, Upper Sugarloaf Key.

Ad valorem tax exemption: Pursuant to LDC Section 135-32, the BOCC may grant an ad valorem tax exemption of 100% of the assessed value of all improvements that result from the restoration, renovation, or rehabilitation of such properties, after the BOCC has received the recommendation from the Division of the Historical Resources of the Florida Department of State. Pursuant to LDC Section 135-33(a), only properties described as historic property in Section 135-31 and located within the unincorporated county is eligible for an application for the ad valorem tax exemption authorized by Section 135-32. Pursuant to LDC Section 135-31, historic property means a building, site, structure, or object that is designated as an archaeological, historical, or cultural landmark under Article 1 of this chapter. Pursuant to LDC Section 135-3(b), the division is hereby designated as the representative of the BOCC for reviewing application for the tax exemption authorized by section. 135-32. Number of ad valorem tax exemption projects, improvements in 2025-one.

National Register of Historic Places: Pursuant to LDC Section 135-3(g)(8), the HPC has the power and duty to make recommendations on nominations of historic properties to the National Register of Historic Places. Pursuant to LDC Section 135-2 National Register of Historic Places, means the list of historic properties significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture, maintained by the Secretary of the Interior as established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, 16 USDA, 470, as amended. There were no recommendations on nominations to the National Register of Circular Places in 2025.

Certificates of appropriateness: Pursuant to LDC Section 135-2, certificate of appropriateness means an authorization for work to be done to a designated historic property or structure, or any property or structure within the Tavernier Historic District. There are 2 types of certificates. One (1) Regular Certificate Of Appropriateness (RCOA) issued by the Planning Director for ordinary repairs or maintenance to a designated historic property or structure, or any property or structure within the Tavernier Historic District, and as described in subsection 135-6(a)(2); and Two (2) special certificate of appropriateness (SCOA) issued by the Historic Preservation Commission for the renovation, rehabilitation, restoration, or demolition of a contributing or designated historic property or structure, for new construction within the Tavernier Historic District, or for permission to dig or otherwise excavate in the case of an archaeological landmark. All renovation, rehabilitation, restoration, or demolition of contributing or designated historic build public property or structures shall be approved by the BOCC following recommendation by the Historic Preservation Commission. Pursuant to LDC Section 135-3(g), the HPC has the power and duty to: three (3) issue or deny special certificates of appropriateness in accordance with this article and; four (4) entertain appeals of the planning director's denial of regular certificates of appropriateness, and report to the HPC's findings to the Planning Director for action. There were 10 Special Certificates of Appropriateness (SCOA) issued in 2025. Regular Certificates of Appropriateness (RCOA) issued by the Planning Director in 2025 is estimated at about 260. There were no RCOA's denied by the Planning Director and appealed to the HPC in 2025.

Historic Designations: Pursuant to LDC Section 135-3(g)(2) the HPC has the power and duty to make recommendations to the BOCC on request to designate historic property and, if necessary, make recommendations to the BOCC on proposed rescission of such designations. Pursuant to LDC Section 135-2, designation historic property or structure means a building, site, structure, or object that is designated by BOCC resolution as an archaeological, historical, or cultural landmark in accordance with this article. The total number of Historic Designations Districts – two (2); Tavernier Historic District Ordinance number 019-2005, Pigeon Key Historic District, also a national district; Resolution 524-1993; and 24 sites and properties. Lignumvitae Key, also a national district resolution number 131-

1996, Indian Key, also a national archaeological site, Resolution number 132-1996, Key Largo Anglers Club, Clubhouse and Dockmasters Building, Resolution number 502-1993, Ocean Reef Yachtel C2 Resolution number 492-2000, Hodgman House, Resolution number 130-1996, the Hermitage Resolution Number 276-2001, Woods House, Resolution Number 133-1996. Lohmayer Home, Resolution Number 523-1996, Old Tavern Tea Room, Resolution number 527, 1996, Tavernier Hotel, resolution number 526-1996 former Standard Oil Gas Station Resolution Number 525, 1996. Copper Kettle resolution number 524, 1996, Allen House, Resolution number 538, 1996, Pinder Albury House, Resolution number 167, 1997, Merlin Albury House, resolution number 287 1997. Tavernier Methodist Church, resolution number 288, 1997, 136 Tavernier Drive, resolution number 445, 1997, Lowe House Resolution Number 449, 1987, 181 Coconut Row, Resolution Number 447, 1997. Wilkinson House Resolution Number 448, 1997, 122, Lowe Street, Resolution Number 446, 1997, 120 Tavernier Drive, resolution number 444, 1997, Old Tavernier School, Resolution numbers 201-2000 and 276-2000 Planter Settlement Resolution number 567A-1999, roads and bridges four (4), also a national district. Long Key Railroad Bridge Resolution number 059, 1992, 7 Mile Railroad Bridge Resolution number 059-1992, Bahia Honda Railroad Bridge, Resolution Number 059-1992, and Old Overseas Highway on Cudjoe Resolution Number 172, 2002. There were no recommendations from the HPC to the BOCC for designations.

SECTION III: Highlights

Online building permit review software: County staff have been using the new online building permit review software community development, also known as Opal, since late 2023, in an effort to streamline and increase the efficiency of the building permit review process. Planning staff tested the software with the historic parameters and verified the condition successfully worked as intended.

Updates the Tavernier Historic District Preservation guidelines: On September 14, 2023, the BOCC entered into a contract with the Archaeological & Historical Conservancy for professional services to update the Tavernier Historic District Preservation Guidelines written in 2005 to meet current conditions, pursuant to a Small Matching Grant from the State of Florida, Department of State, Division of Historical Resources (Grant No. 24.h.sm.100.003). At which time, County staff identified significant insufficiencies in the regulatory implementation and recommended revisions of the revised guidelines. Planning Commission Resolution No. P11-24 was issued on August 12th, 2024, recommending denial of the adoption of the revised guidelines. Staff are preparing to submit the improved updated Tavernier Historic District Preservation Guidelines to the Planning Commission for consideration in early 2026.

Indian Key State Historic and Archeological District:

The Indian Key State Historic and Archeological District is currently part of the State Park system. The HPC recently considered and approved two Special Certificates of Appropriateness (SCOAs) (one of which was approved in January 2026 and another in September 2024) for improvements to access infrastructure in the State Park, including restoring trails and rebuilding a dock damaged in Hurricane Irma in 2017. The restoration of this site is an on-going project. The HPC and staff look forward to the forthcoming restoration of access to this irreplaceable site.

SECTION IV: Challenges

Staffing Change:

County staff navigated a challenging change in HPC organization when the contract with Historic Florida Keys Foundation came to an end on September 30, 2025. However, County staff have successfully maintained continuity of the duties and responsibilities of the HPC during this transition and County staff are further examining methods to increase efficiency in review of RCOAs and SCOAs.

SECTION V: Projects

County staff and HPC members will continue to fulfill the duties outlined in LDC Sec. 135-3. Projects which staff and members have identified to improve the program are below.

Webpage:

As part of the input provided by HPC members on the updated Tavernier Historic District Preservation Guidelines, members indicated interest in an overall guide for residents and applicants regarding the Certificate of Appropriateness process. Planning staff have taken this guidance and are reviewing the functionality of a County webpage, similar to the webpage for the Special Vacation Rental Program, dedicated to directing the public towards historic resources and guidance.

Planning Staff GIS Training:

To increase efficiency and software functionality, Planning staff have coalesced important historical spatial data as layers and tools in GIS. Planning staff are actively training how to use and share these tools to improve and streamline building permit review, property analyses, and customer service.

Ms. Poole asked if we are updating the database with information on historic properties, based on the age of a structure. Mr. Francis-Siburg stated that that level of monitoring is not currently in place, but if that is something that the Commission is interested in pursuing, staff can begin to prepare. Ms. Poole stated it would be good to add that flag in there. It may be the same structure, but over time, different things become historical. Mr. Shea stated that it could be an amendment to the district or if there are other neighborhoods that meet a new district standard, and the creation of those districts.

Mr. Shea also noted that he is required to do annual training for AICP and CFM, and he will continue to provide us with what he does every year as part of his continuing education. There is also the Florida on Main Street program, the State Level Conference for Historic Preservation.

Mr. Francis-Siburg noted an error on line 18 of page 4; the correct code section referenced is Section 135-32, not 315-32 as listed in the staff report.

Public testimony

There was no public input.

Mr. Shea made a motion to approve the 2025 Annual HPC Report; including the request to add in flagging system on historic properties, as well as including his continuing education to the staff training section. Mr. Bertelli seconded the motion. There were no objections, motion passed unanimously.

5. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION PROVIDING AN HPC ADVISORY RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL FOR THE MONROE COUNTY BOCC TO ADOPT THE REVISED TAVERNIER HISTORIC DISTRICT PRESERVATION GUIDELINES (GUIDELINES) INITIALLY APPROVED BY THE BOCC PURSUANT TO ORDINANCE NO. 019-2005, AS UPDATED BY MONROE COUNTY PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT PROFESSIONAL STAFF FOLLOWING MONROE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. P11-24 RECOMMENDING DENIAL OF THE REVISED GUIDELINES AS HAD BEEN PREPARED BY "ARCHAEOLOGICAL & HISTORICAL CONSERVANCY, INC.", WHICH HAD ENTERED INTO A CONTRACT TO PROVIDE SAID UPDATE WITH MONROE COUNTY ON OR ABOUT

SEPTEMBER 13, 2024, PURSUANT TO A SMALL MATCHING GRANT FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA – DEPARTMENT OF STATE – DIVISION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES (GRANT NO. 24.H.SM.100.003).

Staff Presentation and Recommendations:

Background and prior relevant county actions. On August 17, 2005, the Monroe County Board of County Commissioners, adopted Ordinance number 019-2005, amending the text of the Monroe County Land Development Code, LDC and amended the Monroe County Land Use Map to create the Tavernier Historic District Overlay, adopted the Tavernier Historic Preservation guidelines, and adopted standards and guidelines for the review of development projects, added definitions, and provided for certificates of appropriateness for certain development within the Tavernier Historic District.

In 2023, the Monroe County BOCC accepted a small matching grant from the State of Florida Department of State Division of Historic Resources, Grant Number 24.h.sm.100.003, for the project design guideline update for the Tavernier Historic District and publicly owned historic structures in Unincorporated Monroe County. Because Monroe County had achieved certified local government (CLG) status, no matching funds were required from Monroe County.

On September 14, 2023, the Monroe County BOCC entered a contract on September 14, 2023, with the Archaeological and Historical Conservancy, Inc. for professional services to update the current Tavernier Historic District Preservation guidelines adopted pursuant to Ordinance number 019-2005. Pursuant to the small matching grant fund, grant number 24.h.sm.100.003.

Between December 2023 and June 2024, the Monroe County Historic Preservation Commission discussed recommendations on the update to the Tavernier Historic District Preservation guidelines. On June 3, 2024, the HPC approved a resolution recommending approval of the update to the Tavernier Historic District Preservation Guidelines through resolution number HP 06-2024. This resolution was signed and dated June 27, 2024, following the receipt of the Archaeological and Historical Conservancy, Inc. of the completed revised update to the Tavernier Historic District Preservation guidelines. The Monroe County Planning and Environmental Resources Department staff identified insufficiencies in the regulatory implementation of the revised Tavernier Historic District Preservation guidelines.

On July 23, 2024, the Planning Commission approved a resolution recommending denial of the update to the Tavernier Historic Preservation Guidelines through resolution number P11-24, as a result of the concerns raised by the Planning and Environmental Resources Department staff. On August 21, 2024, the BOCC confirmed the acceptance of receipt of the final product received from archaeological and Historical Conservancy, Inc. Consisting of a comprehensive update to the Tavernier Historic District preservation guidelines prepared by AHCI in accordance with Section 7.2.1, Article 7 of the Board's contract with AHCI and a small matching grant from the State of Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources grant number 24.h.sm.100.003.

On January 6th, 2025, the HPC indicated a desire to continue working with the Planning and Environmental Resources Department staff to update the Tavernier Historic District Preservation guidelines periodically between January 2025 and February 2026. The HPC would discuss recommendations on updates to the Tavernier Historic District Preservation guidelines, and paying special attention to its regulatory implementation. Staff recommends approval of the updated guidelines.

Public testimony

There was no public input.

Mr. Francis-Siburg mentioned additional revisions that would be required: The numbering/listing on page 23 would need to be corrected; remove the watermark on pages 27, 30 & 31.

Board Discussion - None

Mr. Shea made a motion to approve the updates to the Tavernier Historic District Preservation Guidelines, including the formatting edits mentioned by Mr. Francis-Siburg. Mr. Bertelli seconded the motion. There were no objections, the motion carries unanimously.

Other Business:

Mr. Francis-Siburg reviewed the upcoming HPC schedule with the Commission. Ms. Poole stated that the only date that she had a conflict with is the July 6th meeting date. Mr. Shea stated that he will not be able to attend the June HPC meeting.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated that Commissioner DeLoach raised concern of demotion by neglect; about the property located at 133 Sunrise Drive in the Tavernier Historic District. Commissioner DeLoach stated that several neighbors have shared their concerns regarding the maintenance of this property. Mr. Shea asked that staff follow up with all departments on this property.

Adjournment.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:55 P.M.