



**MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD**

MINUTES

Wednesday, May 27, 2026
2:05 p.m.

Location:

Miami-Dade Public Library System
Main Library
101 West Flagler Street
Arva Parks McCabe Auditorium
Miami, FL 33130

The meeting of the Historic Preservation Board (“HPB”), on Wednesday, May 27, 2026, at 2:05 p.m., was held in-person. For additional informational visit:
<http://www.miamidade.gov/planning/boards-historic-preservation.asp>

I. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by **Board Chair Bob Ross** at 2:05 p.m. and requested roll call.

Board Members

Jared Beck	Absent (excused)
Dr. Paul George	Present
Alyssa Kriplen, V Chair	Present
Bob Ross, Chair	Present
Cecilia Stewart	Present
Jose Vazquez	Present
Enrique Vecin	Absent (excused)

Staff Members Present

Sarah Cody, HP Chief
Tamara McDonald, HP Specialist
George A. da Guia, Principal Planner
Jerry Bell, Assistant Director for Planning

Assistant County Attorney

Eddie Kirtley

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Bob Ross, Chair, noted that he had a correction for the Chair’s Report section of the April 22, 2026 minutes, which he read and provided to staff in written format for correction. He then asked members to review the minutes of the April 22, 2026, Board Meeting for approval.

Paul George, Board Member, moved to approve the minutes of the April 22, 2026, meeting with the correction requested by Chair Ross. **Jose Vazquez, Board Member**, seconded the motion. The motion was approved by group vote.

Jared Beck	Absent
Dr. Paul George	Yes
Alyssa Kriplen, V Chair	Yes
Bob Ross, Chair	Yes

Cecilia Stewart	Yes
Jose Vazquez	Yes
Enrique Vecin	Absent

III. SWEARING IN OF THE PUBLIC

Bob Ross, Chair, swore in those present who would be making comments at the meeting.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

Bob Ross, Chair, stated the due process statement and stated that he would take public comment on non-public hearing items as the items come up on the agenda.

V. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Requests for Deferral

There were no requests for deferral.

B. Public Hearing Items

PH1. Special Certificate of Appropriateness #2026-09-S
 North Shore Crest Historic District
 671 NE 87 Street
 Miami, FL 33138

Tamara McDonald, Historic Preservation Specialist, presented the staff report, for the replacement of windows for single family residence located in the North Shore Crest Historic District. The residence is a contributing structure in that district which was established in December of 1999. She noted staff's review of available records of the structure and noting the original windows were an aluminum awning style. Ms. McDonald specified the proposed scope of work is for window replacements includes horizontal roller windows for three areas at the main façade with other openings being noted for casement or single hung windows. She referenced the window diagram provided relevant historic and contemporary photographs of the structure for site orientation with window openings marked noting the three entry façade windows of particular interest.

Ms. McDonald provided analysis of applicable Secretary of Interior Standards and Resilient Rehab guidelines before providing Staff's overall recommendation to approve with conditions COA 2026-9-S, outlining Staff's suggestion that the proposed window installation be revised to reflect a use of single hung or casement windows with muntin strips used to replicate the historic window pattern, and that the revised plan should be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval before installation and that upon completion updated site photographs be provided to OHP with any proposed changes in scope or materials. submitted to OHP to determine if additional approvals are needed.

Bob Ross, Chair, opened floor for discussion.

Sarah Cody, Historic Preservation Chief, noted property owner was present to answer questions if needed.

Shaily Lozada, Representative of owner noted the owner is open to alternative window framing color and clear glass and use of muntin to replicate the window pattern. She also noted that the district does have some houses with the bronze framed windows.

Bob Ross, Chair, opened the floor to the Board for questions and comments.

Alyssa Kriplen, Vice Chair, Mark 13, notes the tri-window replacement with single hung would suggest horizontal rollers with muntins are the best solution. Mark 1, she notes that the center muntin would be heavier so a slider with muntin there would be acceptable there as well. She noted that for impact glass the awning style would result in a much thicker panes of glass and profile for the windows. Mark 2 on side façade at main as an 8x8 does make sense as a single hung option with muntin, for mark 3 as well. 13 and 1 as horizontal rollers with muntins would make sense.

Board discussed revision of proposed conditions of approval.

Bob Ross, Chair, opened the floor for discussion on the motion.

Paul George, Board member, asked if there should be some clarification on conditions of approval.

Alyssa Kriplen, Vice Chair, offered a motion to approve with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall revise the proposed windows on the south (front) façade and submit to staff for administrative review as follows:
 - a. Windows identified as ‘Mark 13’ and ‘Mark 1’ on the applicant submitted materials shall be horizontal rolling windows as proposed, with muntin strips to replicate the original light pattern.
 - b. Windows identified as ‘Mark 2 and ‘Mark 3’ on the applicant submitted materials shall be single-hung windows as proposed, with muntin strips to replicate the original light pattern.
2. The applicant shall replicate muntin pattern seen on the existing windows.
3. The applicant shall submit photographs of each façade showing the installed windows upon completion of installation.
4. Any proposed changes to the scope of work, including window style, framing or glass color and muntin replication shall be provided to the Office of Historic Preservation to determine if additional approvals are required.

Paul George, seconded the motion. Motion was approved by group vote.

Jared Beck	Absent
Dr. Paul George	Yes
Alyssa Kriplen, V Chair	Yes
Bob Ross, Chair	Yes
Cecilia Stewart	Yes
Jose Vazquez	Yes
Enrique Vecin	Absent

Sarah Cody, Historic Preservation Chief, asked point of clarification that Board’s conditions did not include requirements for bronze framing or grey tint glass. Board confirmed these items were not part of the conditions.

PH2. Historic Site Designation

Goulds Queen Anne
13301 SW 232 Street
Goulds, FL 33170

Tamara McDonald, Historic Preservation Specialist, presented the staff report. Ms. McDonald outlined staff's report on the proposed site for designation noting the proposed Goulds Queen Anne Historic Site is located on SW 232 ST. The parcel is on the north side of the street which divides the Goulds and Princeton communities. The property has been noted as a potential site for designation in both the Heritage at Risk and 2024 Goulds Heritage Resource Survey.

She also noted the property is subject to concurrent zoning and Comprehensive Development Master Plan amendment applications seeking to ultimately clear the site and construct 67 townhouse units to provide workforce housing.

Ms. McDonald noted applicable criteria for designation for the proposed site are Criteria a, b, and c outlining these address the social and cultural history of the site, a site associated with a significant historic figure of our past or a site that represents a distinctive type, period, style of architecture or method of construction or work of a master architect.

Ms. McDonald presented a slide deck presentation highlighting aspects of the designation report provided for consideration. She noted staff's evaluation of historical research noting the architectural style of the residence as Queen Anne possibly being an early construction circa 1900 she pointed out the ornamental wood work, the exterior porch areas and other features. its association with important figures of the local community history as related to agricultural land owners of the period including Arthur and Polly Mays, William Cauley, Lyman Gould and others from the initial settlement through expansion of the community.

She noted, that research indicates early land grant transfers and associated landowners linked to the site including I. F. Talbott. She noted that the property illustrates the early architecture of the area and the surroundings in the core of an agricultural community which is how the communities were formed.

She noted the associated area landmarks and history including the Store Porch, Princeton Railroad Station and Caldwell residence. The association with historic figures in particular Isaac Fenton Talbott provides a strong standing for the site as a touchstone to early history of the growth of community.

Ms. McDonald noted staff's consideration of environmental concerns as related to long term preservation of the structure noting it is not in an area seen as highly susceptible for flood risk or severe storms. Its low vulnerability would entail long-term preservation plan for standard mitigation options for flooding and resiliency would apply.

Ms. McDonal also outlined consideration of planning associated with the site. She addressed photographs that highlight the former location of the Caldwell residence which was once located directly across from the proposed site noting it is a resource that has been demolished and replaced by a new housing development. She noted the change in overall architectural landscape of the community from 2015 to 2025 noting a significant portion of agricultural land and prominent historic structures present up until 2020 specifically, the Caldwell residence and the proposed site. She

notes the aerials also highlight the architectural character of the residence, in its roof configuration.

In consideration public and private plans for improvement and development of the site she notes that as an area considered for potential designations and how a historic resource might be impacted or integrated into those plans. She notes affordable and/or workforce housing is an area of consideration staff feels that can be achieved through a collaborative effort to balance preservation with new development to meet the needs of the community, highlighting there is a strong potential for adaptive reuse of the structure within a larger development.

Ms. McDonald outlines staff's recommendation for the designation which specifies designation would be largely limited to the primary structure and alterations that impact the visibility of the structure and exterior alterations to the structure. The proposed designation outlines parameters for review for potential relocation of the structure, selective demolition of the north and east one-story sections through an administrative COA process and allow for routine rehab and repairs to be addressed administratively; with more extensive and impactful projects outside of those parameters following the standard COA and Special COA processes as required.

Bob Ross, Chair, thanked Ms. McDonald for her "comprehensive and thoughtful" report and then opened floor for public comments and questions from Board.

Pedro Gassant, Holland and Knight, representative of property owner, presented a slide deck, questioning the applicability of designation criteria to the subject structure. (See Exhibit 1.) He first noted his respect for staff and their work however feels that the provided report is speculative noting the date of photographs provided in report and their associated dates: photographs of 1980, 1993 and 2000, and although staff notes evidence of structure on site pre 1900, however staff report notes the structure as of 1913 and that property appraiser records associate construction date of structure as 1930. He asserts that the report does not provide detail that ties the design of the Queen Anne styled structure to a period prior to 1980. He offers as such there is no merits for designation based on that.

Mr. Gassant also asserts that it does not meet the criteria for historic designation, as the date of construction cannot be verified, and that its association with Mr. Talbott noting that the Goulds report references the construction of the residence at a period after Mr. Talbott had transferred the property to Mr. Anderson.

He questioned whether the structure had been demolished after Hurricane Andrew and rebuilt, or if the Queen Anne style had been applied at some time in the more modern period. He showed aerial photographs from before and after Hurricane Andrew.

He asserts the connection to Talbott relies on conjecture as to who was issued the land grant and that the structure may have transferred to Mr. Talbott after that. Mr. Gassant reads excerpt from the prepared report and referencing photos of the 1980s and that there is no documentation showing that there was a structure in the Queen Anne style for over 100 years with no changes to the property and that the provided information is speculative.

He notes staff's use of the phrasing to describe the customary process of proving land grants and notes language such as "it is reasonable to conclude," noting report says an exact construction date is not confirmed "it is believed that an early build out of the

residence was completed pre-1900s and that the property was later sold to Ernest J. Anderson, who more fully improved the Queen Anne style structure.” He argues there is nothing in the designation report ties the property to I.F. Talbott noting the provided information links construction of the structure to Anderson and that a connection to Talbott is arguable based on the documentation provided. Noting Mr. Talbott’s primary residence, a different site, arguing that there is no evidence a Talbott or any historic figure is associated with the subject site.

As to criteria C, he notes the Queen Anne date of construction is not confirmed and it could have been refurbished and changed. He notes that there is no evidence of the Queen Anne on site prior to 1980 but notes there is indication from report that there were alterations to site enclosed porches, kitchens and an unsafe structures action in 1994 which he argues resulted in a demolition of the structure. He provides an aerial 1993 image indicating the damage to site and 1994, arguing that the main structure appears to have been demolished. He argues the closeness in time from initiation to conclusion of the unsafe structures action indicates the structure was demolished.

Outlines proposed plans for site for workforce housing goals with, 13 of 67 units planned for workforce housing, and notes code 16A requires analysis of impact of designation. He argues that impact is unclear, but that information provided does not support designation asserting that the date of creation, historical ties to historic figures, no documentation of structure prior to 1980 so it should not be designated.

Bob Ross, opened floor for questions and comments.

Paul George, Board member, acknowledged questions Mr. Gassant raised regarding dates associated with site.

Jose Vasquez, Board member, asked for clarification regarding reference to unsafe structures action.

Pedro Gassant, owner representative, offered that those referenced in his commentary were related to the 1994 action.

Bob Ross, provides in reference to Mr. Gassant’s assertion as to the speculation on the land grant process, his understanding is that historically that living on the property is required to obtain ownership and that thought that the assertion that the Queen Anne style home may have been constructed during the post-war period is unlikely. He believes the Queen Anne dates to the early 20th century.

Paul George, notes his general consensus that the Queen Anne style was generally not being designed in the 20th century largely.

Alyssa Kriplen, asked why staff was not permitted access for a site visit noting that it would potentially provide an immediate avenue for staff to assess the structure and its material finishes, like presence of Dade County pine to better date construction.

Pedro Gassant, noted that the property owner does not believe the property to be historic and does not want to provide access.

Alyssa Kriplen, acknowledged that and emphasized that doing so would help alleviate many questions and notes that the shadows present on the aerials indicate that the home is present, including its defining steep roof. She also noted that a site

visit may help also assess potential adaptive reuse of the structure and its impact on development.

Pedro Gassant, argues the provided information is speculative and not sufficient for designation.

Alyssa Kriplen, Vice Chair, notes that there is always a degree of speculation for this time period as to what was or wasn't there, she also notes that an unsafe structure action may have been initiated procedurally and closed out once a site assessment found it was not unsafe not that the building was demolished. She notes the provided appraisers records in the report and asked if there were Sanborn maps located for the site. She also noted that it is very unlikely the roof would have been removed and rebuilt in the Queen Anne style which is visible in the aerial and the sketch provided noting a site visit would be helpful in fully assessing merit for designation.

Ms. Cody noted that this area is not included in Sanborn or Hopkins maps, as it was too far removed from city centers.

Pedro Gassant, notes that the discrepancy of dates in the report are speculative and bring into question the date of construction for the Queen Anne structure and staff needs to substantiate site meets criteria.

Ms. Cody, notes that staff does have a 1969 image of the structure but as the photo quality was poor they were not included in the report. She brought the image up on her phone and showed it to the Board and Mr. Gassant, noting she would attach it as an exhibit to the meeting minutes. (See Exhibit 2.)

Pedro Gassant, notes he objects to the additional images presented as they are not included in the designation report.

Bob Ross, asked for clarification as to when staff started work on the designation report.

Alyssa Kriplen asked for clarification as to the initiation of the designation.

Ms. Cody, provided initial work began in December 2025 and that staff initiated at the previous meeting with public hearing to be schedule for the May meeting.

Bob Ross, closed public comments.

Alyssa Kriplen, asked staff, if designated and if there were images found later showing it was rebuilt in 1994, what would the impact be on potential development She asked for clarification on a way to stay demolition until board determines.

Eddie Kirtley, Assistant County Attorney, stated that applicant would have appellant rights due to them if designated, to appeal the designation, as to additional evidence gathered later as to if designation is proper applicant can also initiate action to de-designate, which would follow the same process as designation. He also clarified there is a current moratorium in place, and that if the Board opts to defer decision to next meeting, moratorium would stay in place and demolition permits would not proceed in that time.

Alyssa Kriplen, asked staff if there is a possibility of staff finding additional photographs,

Ms. Cody, noted it is rare to find very old photographs available but that staff can undertake additional research and see what they find.

Alyssa Kriplen asked for clarification if the 1969 photo was from the appraiser records which **Ms. Cody** confirmed. She notes whether it was built in 1930 or 1913 it is outside the 50 year window and offered commentary as to potential integration of the structure into new development.

Bob Ross, asked if staff had attempted to seek information from the public as to site photographs and information related to the site history or ownership.

Ms. Cody noted that staff has not but would be willing to engage with community members for that she also clarified for the Board, that staff has provided 3 criteria it feels are met for consideration however to designate a site need only meet one criteria.

Alyssa Kriplen, noted that applicants assertion as to density impact as a point of argument against designation, isn't really something we can explore without a site plan.

Eddie Kirley, hardship criteria does not apply at the time of designation, as designation doesn't deny rights to alter structure and redevelopment.

With no further questions or comments, Alyssa Kriplen, Vice Chair, made a motion to approve designation as recommended by staff. **Jose Vazquez** seconded the motion. The motion failed by group vote.

Jared Beck	Absent
Dr. Paul George	No
Alyssa Kriplen, V Chair	Yes
Bob Ross, Chair	No
Cecilia Stewart	No
Jose Vazquez	Yes
Enrique Vecin	Absent

Paul George noted that he believes additional information is needed to decide. **Alyssa Kriplen**, noted that the ability to acquire additional information would be limited given lack of site access.

Paul George motioned to defer the public hearing to the June 24, 2026 meeting to allow OHP Staff to undertaken additional information gathering and outreach. **Chair Ross** seconded the motion. The motion was approved by group vote.

Jared Beck	Absent
Dr. Paul George	Yes
Alyssa Kriplen, V Chair	Yes
Bob Ross, Chair	Yes
Cecilia Stewart	Yes
Jose Vazquez	Yes
Enrique Vecin	Absent

Alyssa Kriplen, Vice Chair, requested that the property owner return at the deferred hearing with the following information:

- A site plan that shows the density that the site can accommodate, if the structure is designated/preserved along with new development
- Information on exploring the possibility to parcel out the area with the home and sell it separately
 - If this approach was taken, how much density could be accommodated on the remainder of the application area?
- Information, including cost, on potential relocation of the structure

Eddie Kirtley, Assistant County Attorney, confirmed that the HPB can make the request, but that the property owner/representative is under no obligation to provide such materials.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

NB1. Chair's Report

Bob Ross, Chair, indicated he had nothing to report.

NB2. Chief's Report

Sarah Cody, HP Chief, indicated she had nothing to report.

NB3. Attorney's Report

Eddie Kirtley, Assistant County Attorney, had nothing to report

NB4. Board Member Reports

Board Members had nothing to report.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to be heard before the Board, **Bob Ross** adjourned the meeting at 3:36 p.m.