

HPC

Monroe County Historic Preservation Commission MINUTES

Friday August 22, 2025

2:00 PM Regular Meeting:



Call to Order.

Roll Call.

Present and answering the roll call were Chair Commissioner Brian Shea, Vice Chair Commissioner Kate Deloach, Commissioner Erica Poole and Commissioner Leslie Calero. Commissioner Brad Bertelli was absent.

Staff present: Derek Howard, Assistant County Attorney
Stephanie Reed, Planner
Diane Silvia, Preservationist

Adoption of the Minutes from the meeting on July 7, 2025.

Erica Poole motioned to approve the minutes of the meeting on July 7, 2025. Brian Shea seconded the motion. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

Changes to the Agenda.

The review order was changed. Items 2 through 4 were reviewed first, followed by item 1.

Application for Special Certificate of Appropriateness

- 2. LOUIS J. GARCIA AND PATRICIA KAY GARCIA** (File #2025-130) ARE SEEKING APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A TWO-STORY, CBS SINGLE-FAMILY HOME WITH A POOL AND PAVER DRIVEWAY AT 215 TARPON STREET, WITHIN THE TAVERNIER HISTORIC DISTRICT, HAVING PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 00506780-000000 AND DESCRIBED AS A PARCEL OF LAND IN SECTION 34, TOWNSHIP 62 SOUTH, RANGE 38 EAST, MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

Staff presentation and recommendation

Diane Silvia read the staff report noting the applicable standards and guidelines.

Applicant presentation

Angela Garcia represented the project.

Public testimony

Cindy Martin, a neighbor, asked if she could look at the plans.

Staff response

Stephanie Reed was able to pull them up on her computer and have the drawing shown on the viewing screen.

Board discussion

Brian Shea said the structure will have a stucco finish. It is consistent with neighboring structures in terms of mass and scale.

Motion

Erica Poole motioned to approve. Kate Deloach seconded the motion. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

- 3. 239 TAVERNIER, LLC (File #2025-141) IS SEEKING APPROVAL FOR RELOCATION OF A 290 SQUARE FOOT DOWNSTAIRS ENCLOSURE BENEATH THE RESIDENCE LOCATED AT 239 TAVERNIER DRIVE, WITHIN THE TAVERNIER HISTORIC DISTRICT, HAVING PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 00477850-000000 AND DESCRIBED AS A PARCEL OF LAND IN SECTION 34, TOWNSHIP 62 SOUTH, RANGE 38 EAST, MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA.**

Staff presentation and recommendation

Diane Silvia read the staff report noting the applicable standards and guidelines.

Applicant presentation

Krissy Bohnstedt, agent for the owner, represented the project.

Public testimony

There was no public comment.

Staff response

Stephanie Reed said Planning has no concerns. The building permit plans have to match the HPC approved plans.

Board discussion

There was no board discussion.

Motion

Kate Deloach motioned to approve. Erica Poole seconded the motion. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

- 4. MONROE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS (FILE #2025-143) IS SEEKING APPROVAL TO INSTALL AN ALUMINUM SECURITY GATE AND AN EMERGENCY BROADCAST/EVENT AUDIO SYSTEM ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 44800 OVERSEAS HIGHWAY, PIGEON KEY, MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA, HAVING PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 00106120-000000 AND DESCRIBED AS ALL OF PIGEON KEY, AN ISLAND APPROXIMATELY 5.31 ACRES LOCATED AT MILE MARKER 45, ALONG THE OLD SEVEN MILE BRIDGE, LOT 1, SECTION 13, TOWNSHIP 66 SOUTH, RANGE 31 EAST, TALLAHASSEE MERIDIAN, AND DEEDED TO THE OVERSEAS ROAD AND TOLL BRIDGE DISTRICT FROM THE FLORIDA EAST COAST RAILWAY COMPANY BY DEED DATED NOVEMBER 9, 1936, AND**

RECORDED IN DEED RECORD G-6, PAGES 46 TO 55, AND THEREAFTER DEEDED TO MONROE COUNTY BY WARRANTY DEED, RECORDED AT OR-15, PAGES 374 TO 376.

Staff presentation and recommendation

Diane Silvia read the staff report noting the applicable standards and guidelines.

Applicant presentation

Kelly McKinnon represented the project.

Public testimony

There was no public testimony.

Staff response

Stephanie Reed pointed out that planning cannot approve this proposal for the gate as it does not meet the guidelines for driveway gates in the Land Development Code, which limits the size to 6 feet tall and 12 feet wide. This proposal is taller and wider than what is allowed. They can either reduce the size to follow the LDC or seek a variance.

Applicant response

Mr. McKinnon said he was not aware of the width limitation. He needs the gate to extend across the whole span.

Ms. Reed said he could apply for a variance for height, width, or both.

Mr. McKinnon requested approval for the design as is, or a smaller version to follow the LDC if they are unable to receive a variance.

Board discussion

There was no board discussion.

Motion

Brian Shea motioned to approve as depicted or smaller if they cannot get a variance. Erica Poole seconded the motion. A roll call vote was held. All voted in favor of the motion. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

- 1. SHARON WARREN** (File #2025-126) IS SEEKING APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A THREE-STORY, SINGLE FAMILY HOME WITH POOL, PAVER DECK AND DRIVEWAY ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 172 AND 176 SUNRISE DRIVE, WITHIN THE TAVERNIER HISTORIC DISTRICT, HAVING PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS 00506200-000000 AND 00506210-000000 AND DESCRIBED AS PARCELS OF LAND IN SECTION 34, TOWNSHIP 62 SOUTH, RANGE 38 EAST, MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA. (CONTINUED FROM THE MEETING HELD JULY 7, 2025)

Staff presentation and recommendation

Diane Silvia read the staff report noting the applicable standards and guidelines.

Applicant presentation

Chris Trentine, CBT Construction & Development, Inc., said this structure is similar to other houses in the neighborhood. They are combining two lots so there will only be one house. With all the vegetation and conservation easement areas, the structure will not be very visible.

Public testimony

Maureen Kelly said they moved here because of the special character of this neighborhood. The neighborhood was severely disrupted by the previous construction. She disagrees with Mr. Trentine. There are so many trees with orange tags marked to be taken down. She is concerned about the wildlife that will be disturbed. She strongly objects to the project. This is not about just this one house, it sets a precedence.

Beth Vonnegut agrees with Ms. Kelly. The previous construction was extremely disruptive to the neighbors. This does not fit in with the small conch houses. This will disturb the wildlife. She is also concerned about where all the trucks will park. When the pool was built the street was trashed.

Cindy Martin said this does not fit with the scale of the neighborhood. With the pool construction, a generator ran for over a year. It was extremely disruptive.

Carol Budisak said this is a very large house with another pool. We understand the applicant owns additional property across the street. We are concerned this will become a Keys style resort venue. The only way they could do that in a residential neighborhood is to become a gated community. They could do this. We are concerned based on what is going on behind the Post Office right now which looks like a resort community. She requested denial of this application.

Scott ? said he loves living here. This project should be looked at in terms of intent.

Beth Vonnegut said the previous work was extremely disruptive with delivery and maintenance trucks. They removed the existing pool to build the new one. This took over a year. It limited our access down there where a lot of us like to walk. The trucks parked on the road. What is the intent? Once it is done, it is done. This is a great neighborhood. She was not aware that a three-story structure was allowed on this street. What is the intent and how long will it take and how it will affect this neighborhood?

Staff response

Stephanie Reed said Planning has no concerns at this time and a Building Permit has been submitted. A ROGO allocation is required. HPC approved plans must match the one submitted for the Building permit.

Applicant response

Chris Trentine explained the owners hired an outside company to construct the pool. They ran into water issues. What was supposed to be a six-month project took almost two years. The ROGO allocations are going away which is why we are pushing it. To me, the house is designed like those in the surrounding neighborhood. There is a significant buffer all around the house.

We will try to keep disruption and noise at a minimum. He apologized for the past disruption.

Board Discussion

Kate Deloach thanked Mr. Trentine for addressing those issues.

Mr. Trentine said if issues come up, please call his office and he will try to make it right.

Ms. Deloach said her main concern is the proposed building's overall height. Is there any willingness to reduce the height?

Erica Poole said she is also concerned with the scale and mass. Other homes are not elevated this high. You have 10-foot ceilings on each floor and the voluntary elevation. You could go to 8-foot ceilings. There are ways to modify this design to make it more in scale with the neighborhood.

Mr. Trentine said the house looks big. It is 36 feet wide and 54 feet long including porches. Less than 1,400 square feet each under air on the second and third floor.

Ms. Poole said parking does not necessarily have to be under the building.

Leslie Calero said her biggest concern is the height. The parking should not be under the building. There are other ways to be creative with the area.

Brian Shea in terms of the scale of the neighborhood. It might help if the structure is moved further away on lot away from the small cottage.

Ms. Reed said on residential property you are allowed to park two vehicles in the 25-foot front yard setback.

Mr. Trentine said the driveway only has room for one car. 18 feet by 8.5 feet is required for one car.

Ms. Poole said if parking were not below this house and there were 9-foot ceilings, you could lower the height by 9 feet.

Mr. Trentine said I understand the math but do not know why we have to lower the house. The house next door that they live in is that high. There are multiple houses this high.

Kate Deloach said there are houses that high on the water.

Mr. Trentine said you just approved a two-story house that has no historical feel. It is 31-32 feet high. We are doing everything to match the historical feel and make it look like some of the houses there and buffer it from view. We are getting stuck on this height thing.

Ms. Reed said they are allowed to clear 4,000 square feet. The side setbacks are 10 feet and 5 feet.

Mr. Shea said you could shift the house away from the conch style house and reduce the other side setback to 5 feet.

Mr. Trentine said we have a time issue otherwise we will not get an allocation. This is an individual property, it is not part of a compound. When you add in AC ductwork, 8-foot ceilings are tough. We have 9.6-foot ceilings from the slab.

Ms. Reed said the conservation easement cannot be less than 5 feet.

Mr. Trentine said we have a hip roof we could make it a flat roof. I am trying to understand.

Mr. Shea asked, is the voluntary elevation due to additional ROGO points.

Mr. Trentine said yes and parking.

Ms. Reed said there are no ROGO points for voluntary elevation. They received points for aggregating the lots.

Mr. Trentine said there is nothing about height restrictions in the historic district, it all based on neighboring properties. We can lower it by two feet, but I don't think it is fair. We are building to the 25-foot setback. We have a 10,000 square foot lot with 4,000 square feet that can be cleared. 6,000 square feet will be conservation land.

Ms. Reed said there should not be an issue with adding more plantings.

Mr. Trentine said if it is an undisturbed area they don't like us to touch it.

Ms. Reed said plantings would need to be reviewed by the biologist.

Mr. Trentine said this will be a lengthy process to make any changes. If we do not come to an agreement today, we will not make the deadline.

Ms. Poole said the proposed building is too tall and does not fit the mass and scale of the surrounding buildings.

Mr. Trentine said he took a number of photos. There are three story houses along the ocean.

Ms. Reed said the deadline is the 12th.

Mr. Shea asked if this project has already gone through internal review.

Ms. Reed said the plans have already been submitted to the building department. It was not that a Special Certificate of Appropriateness was needed. This should be the last requirement. If the plans are changed it will have to be completely reviewed again.

Mr. Trentine said they try to get through the building requirements first to see if there are changes that must be made. We would have to come back to you again if they requested changes after your approval.

Ms. Poole said the roof is at a 3/12 pitch, which is low and the limit for using the proposed metal roofing.

Mr. Trentine said we are at 37 feet, and you just approved a 31-foot-high house.

Ms. Poole said that is a different house and it is only two stories.

Mr. Trentine said you want architectural integrity. We are willing to go a little lower. They could do an approval with conditions.

Ms. Reed said she needs legal to weigh in on how much deviation is allowed between what was previously approved. She will be reviewing what was previously approved to the HPC approval. She wants to see if the height change as a condition could be approved.

Derek Howard said conditions would need to be specific.

Ms. Reed said 239 Tavernier Drive that we looked at today because the downstairs enclosure had a different placement than what had been approved by the HPC. I determined it was different enough to require HPC review. If modified plans come forward I and they do not match I would have to send them back for review unless legal advised otherwise.

Mr. Trentine asked if they could do a conditional approval and then an email approval of the revised plans.

Mr. Howard said he does not think email approval would be lawful. A public meeting would be required.

Ms. Poole asked what if we specify the changes and height limits and we made that part of the motion and made the notations on the elevation.

Mr. Howard said he would be comfortable with that.

Ms. Reed said if this is found lawful and the conditions are specific enough; she would not have a problem with that. She suggested holding off on signing the resolution until we get a corrected plan set that shows what the HPC approved.

Mr. Shea said that would trigger another meeting. We can hand draw the changes on the plans and make a motion to include the specific revisions.

Ms. Reed said the closing date for ROGO is October 12th and it must be thirty days before that.

Mr. Trentine said that gives us three weeks.

Motion

Erica Poole motioned to approve with the following conditions: moving the structure to the left 15 feet to include the 5 foot buffer zone and 5 foot construction buffer zone; decreasing the first floor height by 2 feet with a finished floor elevation at 15.75 NGVD; decreasing the ceiling height of the second floor by 6 inches for a finished floor elevation at 26.75 NGVD; decreasing the ceiling height of the third floor by 6 inches with the top of the plate (beam) at 36.25 NGVD; and the overall building height not to exceed 35 feet above the crown of the road. The transom windows are eliminated with the height reduction. Leslie Calero seconded the motion. A roll call vote was held. All voted in favor of the motion, therefore the motion carried unanimously.

Work must comply with the amended plans as per the HPC's hand drawn notations by the HPC on August 22, 2025.

Other Business:

Ms. Deloach said 133 Sunrise Drive has been purchased and they have cleaned up some of the landscaping. Brian Shea asked that staff keep an eye out for activity at that property.

Adjournment.