

HPC

Monroe County Historic Preservation Commission

MINUTES

Monday, February 23, 2026

10:00 AM Regular Meeting:



Call to Order.

Roll Call.

Present and answering the roll call were Chair Brian Shea, Commissioner Brad Bertelli, and Commissioner Erica Poole.

Commissioner Leslie Calero and Commissioner Kate DeLoach were absent.

Staff present: Derek Howard, Assistant County Attorney
Thomas Francis-Siburg, Acting Planning and Development Review Manager

Adoption of the Minutes from the meeting on January 5, 2026.

Erica Poole motioned to approve the minutes for the meeting held on January 5, 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. **91941 TAVERNIER, LLC (FILE NO. 2025-223)** IS SEEKING APPROVAL TO REVISE HPC RESOLUTION NO. HP 02-2024 SO AS TO ALLOW THE INSTALLATION OF CONCRETE PAVERS ON SAND WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY AND TO INCLUDE CONCRETE AND CHAIN LINK FENCING AND RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 91941 OVERSEAS HIGHWAY, WITHIN THE TAVERNIER HISTORIC DISTRICT, HAVING PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS 00089950-000000, 00089970-000000, AND 00090250-000000 AND DESCRIBED AS THREE PARCELS OF LAND LOCATED WITHIN SECTION 34, TOWNSHIP 62 SOUTH, RANGE 38 EAST, MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

Staff presentation and recommendation

Thomas Francis Siburg provided the commissioners with scope of work, 3 items per plans received on December 12, 2025. Item one (1) had a driveway and walkways consisting of concrete pavers over sand. Item two (2) to add a four (4) foot tall concrete masonry unit block fence, and six (6) foot tall columns with stucco aesthetic within the primary and secondary front yards with a portion in the northerly side yard and a portion in the southerly side yard. Item three (3) a chain link fence along the northeasterly side yard property line.

Mr. Francis-Siburg provided history and relevant prior county actions stating, 91941 Overseas Highway was the site of a single-family residence built in 1958 according to the Monroe County Property Appraiser which was not a contributing structure and nor recorded in the Florida Master Site

file. Historic Preservation Commission Resolution HP 02-2024 file 2023-300, approved the demolition of said residence and construction of a new single-family residence with accessory villas, a garage, a gate house, inground pool and related site improvements. The associated staff report as part of resolution HP 02-2021 included the following relevant statement, “The proposed development is on a very large property and will have limited visibility from the Overseas Highway”. The demolition approved by resolution HP 02-2024 was completed on October 2, 2024. Building permit SFDUP-2023-0225 is currently under review for the replacement single-family residence as approved by HP 02-2024 and includes the proposed request as part of this Special Certificate of Appropriateness Application (SCOA).

Mr. Francis-Siburg read the staff report noting the applicable standards and guidelines. From the Secretary of the Interior Standards those that apply are 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, proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

For Standard 10, new additions adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated that the proposed scope of work is not for a historic structure and the improvements do not propose impacting a historic structure.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated no issued noted.

Item one (1), driveway and walkways consisting of concrete pavers over sand.

Mr. Francis-Siburg read Historic Preservation Commission Resolution HP 02-204, which provided the following condition of approval. Condition number two (2), driveways must be constructed of crushed shell, gravel, or other pervious material.

From the Tavernier Historic District Preservation guidelines site development driveways, page 20, the intent is to prevent the use of impervious materials such as asphalt in the construction of driveways. Driveways are not a requirement in the Historic District however should a driveway be needed, it should be finished with crushed shell, gravel, or other pervious surface. Concrete driveways will be specifically reviewed and may be permissible if the concrete surface does not obscure the historic building or by its size becomes a visible nuisance. Asphalt is not allowed in residential properties.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated that the commission may wish to review the Historic Preservation Commission Resolution HP 02-2024, conditions of approval and the current and unapproved draft guidelines related to concrete paver driveways. It should be noted that the commission has previously approved concrete paver driveways and or walkways elsewhere in the Tavernier Historic District.

Item two (2), four (4) foot tall concrete masonry block fence with six (6) foot tall columns with stucco aesthetic within the primary and secondary front yards, a portion of the northerly side yard and a portion of the southerly side yard. Although this is not a requirement, should a front fence be used, a picket fence with flat wood boards no taller than four (4) feet high painted white is the most appropriate for

the district. Building elements and materials 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.

Exterior walls, new buildings, page 25, 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.

From the Tavernier Historic District Preservation Resolution HP 02-2024, the resolution provided the following condition of approval. Condition of approval number one (1), the stucco on the front stair landing of the single family residence must match that of the columns and banding.

Staff recommended that the commission discuss the compatibility of the proposed concrete masonry unit, block, fence, column height exceeding four (4) feet tall in stucco aesthetic.

Item three (3), a chain link fence along the northeasterly side yard property line.

From the Tavernier Historic District Preservation guidelines, site development fences, page 20, the intent is to maintain the small community ambience by encouraging the placement of white picket fences in the district.

Staff recommended that the Commission discuss the compatibility of the proposed chain link fence along the side property line. It should be noted that one or more properties in the immediate vicinity utilize chain link fencing along the perimeter of said properties. If the Commission chooses to grant a Special Certificate of Appropriateness for items 1, 2 and 3, staff recommends the following conditions of approval; No.1, the Special Certificate of Appropriateness is based on the design and placement of the proposed structures as shown on the site and fence plans signed and sealed by Franco C Diasancio AR on December 10, 2025 as part of this Special Certificate of Appropriateness Application. Condition of approval No. 2, work not specified may not be carried out without an additional (SCOA) or regular certificate of appropriateness approval. This (SCOA) is only for the aforesaid project and does not waive the required approvals for any future structures, modifications or additions. Condition of approval No. 3, the applicant shall apply for and receive a building permit for the aforesaid work. The (SCOA) does not discharge, exempt, or otherwise release the applicant or his/hers heirs, assigns or successors entitled from his or her duty to comply with any additional requirements based on the Florida Building Code and or floodplain design requirements. Condition of approval No. 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

Bart Smith, the agent for the applicant stated, this is a property located in the Tavernier Historic District and was previously approved for the design of the property. After the property was approved for its design, building permit SFDUP-2023-0225 was issued and we are returning before the Historic Preservation Commission for three (3) separate items. Item one (1) is for a concrete block fence along the front and the perimeters that face adjacent properties in Albury Lane and then for the remainder of the property which is as stated before extensively long for six (6) feet of fence that runs the last portion of the property. Mr. Smith then references the presentation on the screen to demonstrate the proposed locations for the concrete block on the property. The chain link fence then goes along the side yards

where it is permissible.

Mr. Smith stated addressed Mr. Shea's comment that the access drive area should be gravel. The permit that was issued identified this area as concrete on pavers and the actual driveway areas for each of the structures were identified as gravel.

Mr. Smith requested to match what was on the building permit that was issued which is the concrete pavement for the area identified on the screen and stated the drive areas will still be pea gravel which is consistent with the code.

Mr. Smith stated, there have been approvals and they have to be reviewed individually when requesting concrete on sand pavers. Based on the length of the drive, the design and the fact that there has already been a building permit issued that has this design and that there is gravel in the areas where you actually pull up to the houses. Mr. Smith does believe this is consistent with the current guidelines and it will be even more consistent with the soon to be adopted updates.

Mr. Smith stated the wall would be four (4) feet in height and concrete block, which is allowed. Mr. Smith agreed with staff's recommendation that the wall be stucco the same as the structures. The remainder being 439 feet of a six (6) foot chain link fence which is also permitted and will run the side yards adjacent to the homes, not adjacent to any of the streets. Mr. Smith stated, he is trying to make sure they are consistent with all approvals for those areas that would be concrete paver on sand and all of the areas that are gravel.

Mr. Smith stated, the proposal is believed to be consistent with HPC guidelines and is requesting approval from the Historic Preservation Commission.

Public testimony

There was no public input.

Staff response

Mr. Francis-Siburg first confirmed if there had been ex parte communication.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated that the subject property is located in the Suburban Residential (SR) Land Use District (LUD). Pursuant to (LDC) Section 114-13(a)(4)(d) within the Suburban Residential (SR) Land Use (Zoning) Districts, fences of up to six (6) feet in height may be permitted, provided that no other residentially developed property is located within 200 feet of the subject property and provided the fences are not located within clear sight triangles as defined in Section 114-201 and/or according to FDOT and national AASHTO standards, whichever is more restrictive;

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, this is specifically within the front yard setback. The proposed fence in the front yard is four (4) feet but with six (6) foot columns and is not located within a clear sight triangle. However, the property is within 200 feet of one or more of the properties that are residentially developed. As such, pursuant to (LDC) Section 114-13(a)(4)(a) Within all land use (zoning) districts, fences of up to five (5) feet in height may be permitted if constructed of chain-link, a four-foot solid fence with a one-foot lattice or louvre top, or another material that does not impair visibility. Construction details and materials for fences, other than chain-link, must be approved by the Planning

Director.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, the plan proposes a fence containing six (6) foot columns and a four (4) foot solid fence wall. The six (6) foot columns exceed the allowed height by the land development code. Planning staff would not be able to approve the fence as currently proposed.

Mr. Francis-Siburg suggested rather than requiring the project to return before the HPC with a revised fence height, Planning staff recommends the HPC consider a condition of approval something to the effect of a reduction in the height of the fence is allowed without additional HPC review in order to comply with the fences and wall requirements of the Monroe County Land Development Code.

Mr. Smith, as the applicant, confirmed he is comfortable with the columns needing to be reduced from six (6) feet to five (5) feet. The applicant is comfortable with the proposed recommended change and no additional applicant response was provided.

Board discussion

Commissioner Erica Poole stated she has no comment.

Commissioner Brad Bertelli stated his concern with the property is even when it came before the HPC last time it states residential. Mr. Bertelli is not convinced that it is a residential property and it seems more bridal or resort style than residential and he is not comfortable with it adhering to the historic. Mr. Bertelli understood that it was previously approved however he previously mentioned similar concern.

Ms. Poole stated, she understands Mr. Bertellis concern however she does not feel like she has the right to the properties final uses. Based on the change of the wall height from six (6) feet to five (5) feet it is a bit more proportional. Ms. Poole is amenable to that as well and that it complies with Planning. Ms. Poole suggested if chain link is proposed, black chain link disappears it might look a little bit better by disappearing in the landscaping but again no jurisdiction on that. When it comes to the pavers with the modifications the Commission is proposing we bring up earth tones to which this is completely compliant.

Mr. Shea stated, he remembered looking up the property and pulling the HPC meeting minutes from two years ago and confirmed that the driveway was discussed. The minutes stated, Mr. Shea said in a response to Devins' comments, driveways should be pervious which will reduce square footage from impervious surface. Our guidelines specify gravel, crushed shell or pervious surface. The concrete wall was also discussed at that time as well so there are no issues with that being conditioned since it is in the same location as the previous concrete wall that was on site.

Mr. Shea added, his only concern then would be if the Historic Preservation Guidelines are not approved with the proposed changes. Mr. Shea asked Derek Howard, Assistant County Attorney if the Commission conditions the approval to include the hopeful eventual adoption of the new guidelines.

Mr. Howard confirmed yes.

Mr. Shea stated, that way the Commission has their bases covered and the applicant would not have to return before the HPC.

Mr. Shea made a motion to approve with the concrete wall with the reduction per Planning, the chain link fence as shown on the plans with the conditions in the staff report as well and with the condition of the driveway, with the condition that the new guidelines be approved.

Ms. Poole seconded the motion. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

Application for Special Certificate of Appropriateness

2. NATHAN WEINBAUM (FILE NO. 2025-237) IS SEEKING APPROVAL TO RENOVATE AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOME, REMOVE AND REPLACE EXISTING WOOD PORCH WITH NEW CONCRETE PORCH, ADD NEW ACCESS STAIRCASE, ADD NEW ELEVATED PORCH SLAB IN REAR OF RESIDENCE, AND REMOVE DECK ON BACK (WEST) SIDE OF RESIDENCE ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 151 OCEAN VIEW DRIVE, WITHIN THE TAVERNIER HISTORIC DISTRICT, HAVING PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 00555310-000000 AND DESCRIBED AS A PARCEL OF LAND IN SECTION 34, TOWNSHIP 62 SOUTH, RANGE 38 EAST, MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

Staff presentation and recommendation

Mr. Francis-Siburg provided history and architecture of the building stating this is a non-contributing wood frame structure built in 1984 according to the property appraisers' records.

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

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, the structure is not historic, no issues noted.

Standard 10, new additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated the structure is not historic, no issues noted.

From the Historic Preservation guidelines placement of additions, page 19, the intent is to protect the integrity of historic buildings by directing the placement of additions to the rear or other inconspicuous locations. Non-contributing structures, the placement of additions should not obscure historic buildings nor harm the districts urban fabric width. Page 21, the intent is to direct the location of an addition to the side of a historic structure so that it does not obscure it. Non-contributing structure additions may be of any width within the required setback if it is determined that the new structure does not obscure or adversely impact the scale of the historic district. Depth, page 21, the intent is to encourage the additions to contributing structures on the less conspicuous part of the lot, ideally in the deep side.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, this addition is visible from the secondary frontage but is in a less conspicuous part of the lot. It does not increase the width of the structure and the increase to depth is on the rear of the structure, no issues noted.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, entry staircase. The proposed new stairway makes for a more prominent

entry and increases the structure depth at the front. It does not however, obscure historic buildings, harm the districts urban fabric, nor adversely impact the scale of the historic district.

Mr. Francis-Siburg suggested, the Commission may wish to discuss the placement and mass of the staircase addition. Two (2), roof shape, page 11, roofs over porches are either attached to a gable and have a roof of similar slopes to the main building or when attached to a hipped roof and have a shed roof as in figure 12 of the guidelines.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, the proposed roof shape of the addition is not consistent with the guidelines for a porch attached to a gabled end.

Mr. Francis-Siburg suggested, the Commission may wish to discuss the appropriateness of the design.

Three (3), roof materials, page 12, metal roofing, V crimp or standing seam is a widely used material, it has low maintenance and long durability it also has good performance in hurricanes and high winds.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated no issues noted.

Four (4), porches, page 14, while porches are an original architectural element of many historic buildings, in many instances they have been alters from the original building form. Either they have been enclosed to add living space to the building or have been added to the original structure at a later time. These alterations are noticeable by studying the exterior walls of former outdoor porches or the railings and roofs of additions. Nevertheless, porches are a building element that belongs in Tavernier.

Five (5) exterior walls, page 13, the building enclosure can be siding or stucco. There are three common wood siding styles novelty, clapboard and board and batten style.

Six (6) railings, page 14, this architectural detail is another common element if historic buildings. The styles and historic railings are minimally detailed and exterior railings are typically found in porches

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, replacement concrete porch with railing. The existing home is on painted white concrete piling foundation, the existing wood porch is proposed to be replaced with a concrete porch, painted white with tiled floor. The reposed railings are horizontal, minimalistic and made of aluminum and cable however the style does not appear typical of porches in the neighborhood. Cable is not a construction material addressed in the guidelines. Nearby examples of porch railings are much more similar to the existing railing which are simple, wooden and vertical.

Mr. Francis-Siburg suggested, the Commission may wish to discuss the architectural details of the design.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated it is recommended that the project includes the demolition of an existing wood elevated porch and stairs, and the construction of a replacement concrete porch with cable railings, and elevated concrete porch to the rear and the addition of a new concrete staircase and entry at the front of the property.

Mr. Francis-Siburg suggested, the Commission may wish to discuss the placement of the entry addition

and the architectural details of the design of the railings.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated it is recommended that any approval be conditioned that any new or replacement structures must meet Land Development Code setback requirements, either via a minor redesign or obtaining a variance approval.

Applicant presentation

The applicant was not in attendance.

Public testimony

There was no public input.

Staff response

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated the subject building is located in the Improved Subdivision Land Use District and Planning staff has determined that the subject structure has lawful nonconforming setbacks. Pursuant to Land Development Code Section 102-57(b) ordinary repair and maintenance. Normal maintenance and repair of nonconforming structures registered in accordance with Section 102-55 may be performed. Pursuant to Land Development Code Section 102-57(c) enlargements, expansions, and extensions. Lawful nonconforming structures that are used in a manner conforming to the provisions of this Land Development Code and the Comprehensive Plan may be enlarged, expanded, or extended, provided that:(1)The improvement does not constitute a substantial improvement;(2)A nonconforming use is not located in the nonconforming structure; and(3)The nonconformity is not further violated.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, the plans currently propose a staircase in the setback, the staircase addition that was not previously existing. The staircase addition is considered to expand the nonconformity thereby further violating the setback. The plan will either need to be revised to remove the proposed addition which expands into the required setback or will need to receive some sort of variance approval for the proposed addition. Rather than require this project to return before the HPC with a revised plan that does not depict the staircase in the required setback.

Mr. Francis-Siburg stated, it is recommended that the HPC consider a condition of approval, something to the effect of, if a variance for the staircase addition is not approved the site and elevation plans may be revised limited to removing the staircase addition without additional HPC review as long as no new expansion into any required setback is proposed.

Board discussion.

Commissioner Erica Poole stated, one of her main concerns is the railing type that is proposed and also a wood picket would be a lot more appropriate for the subject property. Ms. Poole stated her concern about the setback. Ms. Poole stated she does not have a concern with the roof profile.

Mr. Bertelli second the concern regarding the cable railing. Mr. Bertelli stated he would hate to set precedent and see the historic nature of the neighborhood kind of being chipped away slowly which is why I feel like people are pushing and would agree with not being comfortable with the cable and it is not an appropriate design model.

Brian Shea agreed on the cable and stated it should be picket somewhere to the rest of the neighborhood. Mr. Shea stated he went through the images in the guidelines and almost everyone that has a porch has

a picket that is vertical. As for the rear addition, it is on the rear, it is also on the side street but I feel like that is consistent with our guidelines so there are no issues with that. However, the front addition is not consistent and does not meet the districts urban fabric criteria. Mr. Shea would recommend maintaining the stairs in the existing porch rather than having the addition on the front.

Mr. Francis-Siburg confirmed if the Commission is requesting a condition of approval that the railing be wood picket and not cable and that the staircase be maintained within the existing footprint and not as an addition.

Mr. Shea confirmed yes, that would be his recommendation.

Ms. Poole stated if they are maintaining the stair within the existing footprint that is part of the existing nonconforming footprint. If the stair were to move within that footprint and not in the exact same location that it is in, does that still increase the nonconformity.

Mr. Francis-Siburg responded he does not believe there is currently an existing outdoor staircase to the porch. If they maintain the existing staircase and repair it as needed the it is fine because it is lawfully existing.

Mr. Shea amended his motion to include that the staircase can move along that nonconformity, but within that edge of that side. So if it has to be relocated further back in the building as long as it is still within that same porch area.

Mr. Francis-Siburg clarified that the nonconforming setback not be further violated.

Mr. Shea made a motion to approve.

Mr. Bertelli seconded the motion. As there were no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION:

Other Business:

Mr. Francis-Siburg provided a discussion reminder that next week is another regularly scheduled HPC meeting.

Adjournment.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:37 A.M.