



HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

CITY OF BANGOR

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING OF APRIL 16, 2026, 7:00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL
73 HARLOW STREET

MEETING MINUTES

Commission Members Present:

Katie Coe
Peter Keebler
Nathaniel King
Peter Sachs

City Staff Present:

Matt Altiero, Planning Analyst
Anja Collette, Planning Officer
Grace Innis, Assistant City Solicitor
Mike Pullen, HPC Consultant

Chair King called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

New Business:

- 1. Certificate of Appropriateness – 198 Broadway – Map-Lot 047-012 – Broadway Historic District – Applicant/Owner: Steven Farren** – Approval requested for Certificate of Appropriateness at property located at 198 Broadway for the replacement of existing single pane windows with high efficiency windows containing period-correct features. The property is located at Map-Lot 047, in the Broadway Historic District. Applicant/Owner: Steven Farren.

Chair King introduced the agenda item.

Commissioner Keebler introduced a potential concern of prejudicial bias brought to the attention of staff by the applicant.

Applicant Steven Farren described since Commissioner Keebler was determined to have a conflict of interest in one of his previous applications due to him renting space to a historic restoration company, Blackstone Restoration, and that there may be one for the current project.

Chair King asked if Blackstone Restoration had any involvement in the project. Applicant Farren responded no.

Commissioner Sachs asked for clarification of what the previous conflict of interest was. Chair King responded and clarified.

Assistant Solicitor Innis asked whether the applicant was introducing a potential financial conflict of interest or a prejudicial bias. Applicant Farren responded due to the previous recusal that he wanted this to be addressed. Applicant Representative Violette further added that they are not requesting a recusal, however, they did want the Commission to discuss this. Violette also added that they have no reason to believe that Commissioner Keebler would have a conflict of interest or prejudicial bias for the current project.

Assistant Solicitor Innis recommended that the Commission make a motion be made to address the potential conflict of interest. Chair King asked for clarification. Innis responded and clarified. Commissioner Keebler expressed he does not feel that there is a conflict of interest, but the Commission decided he did. Keebler added he believes there is no financial conflict of interest because he would receive the same rent payment no matter who he was renting his property to. Innis recommended that there be a motion made to address the potential conflict.

Commissioner Coe motioned that Commissioner Keebler had no conflict of interest. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Chair King introduced a new image provided by Applicant Farren.

Applicant Farren introduced the new image of previously replaced vinyl windows on his property. Farren presented his project and addressed each of HPC Consultant Pullen's questions. Farren went through the staff drafted standards, addressed them individually, and also discussed the letter from Fire Inspector Vachon.

HPC Consultant Pullen discussed window 12 and suggested that the window will match the existing pattern. Pullen discussed the proposed windows only have a small loss of glass. Pullen described how to care for wooden windows and functionality. Pullen described the stained glass on windows 2 and 3 as a distinctive characteristic.

Applicant Representative Violette discussed the heat loss that goes through the current windows, his past experience with stained glass windows shattering while trying to repair them, and that the windows have a life expectancy. Applicant Farren discussed the already replaced windows were not replaced for no reason.

Chair King asked if the stained-glass windows are damaged and not fit to repair is there another option to replace the features. HPC Consultant Pullen advised the Commission to follow what the applicant is offering for this aspect of the application.

Commissioner Coe asked of the prairie glass would be a replacement for the stained-glass windows. Applicant Farren responded the prairie grid is next to the stained glass and will be custom made if the Commission sees fit. Farren also discussed that if the stained-glass were to shatter, he will consult with Sunrise Glass to replace the stained-glass and does not know the current cost of this replacement. Commissioner Keebler asked if the provided picture is an angle from Broadway. Farren confirmed. Commissioner Sachs emphasized that this

architectural feature be reviewed by the standards of Chapter 148. Applicant Representative Violette reiterated the cost and that this may qualify as an exceptional circumstance.

Chair King opened the public comments.

Two members of the audience expressed support for the project.

Public comments closed.

Commissioner Sachs asked the Commission that the proposal for the prairie windows best satisfies the requirements. Commissioner Coe asked for clarification if Sachs was referencing the stained-glass. Chair King expressed concern for the current condition of the glass and discussed that the Commission take into account what Fire Prevention has submitted. Commissioner Keebler discussed the only part of the application he has concern with is the stained-glass windows. Keebler expressed the current technology does not meet the craftsmanship of the original characteristics. Keebler also asked the Commission if it is technically feasible to replace the prairie glass windows with the original stained-glass.

Applicant Farren confirmed if the Commission decides the proposal for these windows is decided to not be needed, he plans to replace the windows with a 6 over 6 grill design. HPC Consultant Pullen advised the Commission to review the pictures in the application and discussed reasons of the possible stress in the windows. Keebler discussed the willingness of the applicant to preserve the windows and brought forward feasibility of this preservation. Violette asked what the Commission will do if the glass shatters. King and Sachs also asked for clarification. Planning Officer Collette confirmed this can be made into a condition of the approval. Keebler asked Pullen the proposed 6 over 6 grill design would have been the original design. Pullen responded and clarified. Keebler asked if the Commission and applicant would be open to add just the prairie design. King agreed. Pullen said the bottom sash being open does not complicate the installation. Keebler asked if Farren would be open to replace the third window in the same manner if he had to replace it in the future. Farren confirmed he would. Collette recommended this be a condition upon approval.

Chair King asked for a point of order of the drafted Findings and Decision document. Planning Officer Collette confirmed.

Commissioner Sachs made the motion that Part 2, Section 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, and part 3 in its entirety are not applicable. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that the application was deemed complete on April 16, 2026, that the proposed project is a Certificate of Appropriateness, and that the applicant paid all applicable fees. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 2-13, the application satisfied Historic Preservation Code §148-9A requiring that any alteration of the historic structure will preserve or enhance its historical and architectural character. Seconded

by Commissioner Sachs. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 2-13, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code §148-9B(2)(b) requiring that rehabilitation work does not destroy the distinguishing qualities nor character of the structure and its environment. Seconded by Commissioner Coe. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 2-13, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code §148-9B(2)(c) requiring that, while repair is preferable to replacement, in the event that replacement of deteriorated architectural features is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, texture and finish with the condition that the replacement of the two small bay windows that have currently a border of stained glass be replaced with a prairie style pane and the lower glass is clear. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 2-13, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code §148-9B(2)(d) requiring that distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize historic structures is not damaged or destroyed, wherever possible. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 2-13, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code §148-9B(2)(i) requiring that, wherever possible, all alterations to structures shall be done in such a manner that if they were to be removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the original structure would be unimpaired. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on the findings in Parts 1-2 of Section IV of this document, the Project meets the requirements for a Certificate of Appropriateness and therefore grants a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed Project. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. Roll call voted conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Old Business:

- 2. Certificate of Appropriateness – 28 W Broadway – Map-Lot 022-065 – Whitney Park Historic District – Applicant: Blackstone Restoration – Owner: Stephen and Allison Freese** – Approval requested for Certificate of Appropriateness at the property located at 28 W Broadway for the removal of the crown trim abutting the slate roof and retrofit “K-Style” aluminum gutter and downspout, as well as temporarily remove 3 courses of slate in order to install a copper-lined wooden gutter on the east and north sides with a rounded copper downspout. The property is located at Map-Lot 022-065, in the Whitney Park Historic District. Owner: Stephen and Allison Freese.

Chair King introduced the agenda item.

Commissioner Keebler introduced a potential concern of a potential conflict of interest that he rents space to the applicant representative, Blackstone Restoration. Keebler expressed why he does not believe that there is a conflict of interest.

Assistant Solicitor Innis defined financial and special interests to the Commission and discussed with Chair King. Commissioner Coe asked if Legal could offer an opinion. Innis asked Keebler if he gets a percentage of their earnings or a flat rate.

Commissioner Coe made the motion that Commissioner Keebler has a conflict of interest and should recuse himself. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. Roll call vote conducted – none in favor. Motion failed.

Assistant Solicitor Innis clarified the applicant will need the option to postpone the vote because there are only 4 voting members present. Applicant Representative chose to precede.

Applicant Representative Nickerson presented to the podium.

HPC Consultant Pullen asked if the slate being removed will be returned. Applicant representative Nickerson clarified two courses will be returned, but the gutter will take the place of one.

HPC Consultant Pullen asked if the gutter has an ogee profile. Pullen asked if the gutters will be painted. Applicant representative Nickerson confirmed both questions.

Chair King opened the public comments – there were none.

Public comments closed.

Chair King asked the Commission if there were any questions – there were none.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission find that the application was deemed complete on April 16, 2026, that the proposed project is a Certificate of Appropriateness, and that the applicant paid all applicable fees. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Sachs made the motion that Part 2, Section 6, 7, 8, and part 3 in its entirety are not applicable. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Sachs moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 2-3, the application satisfied Historic Preservation Code §148-9A requiring that any alteration of the historic structure will preserve or enhance its historical and architectural character. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

April 16th, 2026

Commissioner Sachs moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 2-3, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code §148-9B(2)(a) requiring that every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use which will require minimum alteration to the structure and its environment. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Sachs moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 2-3, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code §148-9B(2)(b) requiring that rehabilitation work does not destroy the distinguishing qualities nor character of the structure and its environment. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Sachs moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 2-3, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code §148-9B(2)(c) requiring that, while repair is preferable to replacement, in the event that replacement of deteriorated architectural features is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, texture and finish. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Sachs moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 2-3, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code §148-9B(2)(d) requiring that distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize historic structures is not damaged or destroyed, wherever possible. Seconded by Commissioner Coe. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Sachs moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 2-3, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code §148-9B(2)(e) requiring that the changes which have taken place in the course of time have acquired historic significance in their own right are retained and preserved wherever possible. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Sachs moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 2-3, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code §148-9B(2)(i) requiring that, wherever possible, all alterations to structures shall be done in such a manner that if they were to be removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the original structure would be unimpaired. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed

Commissioner Sachs moved that the Commission finds that, based on the findings in Parts 1-2 of Section IV of this document, the Project meets the requirements for a Certificate of Appropriateness and therefore grants a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed Project. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call voted conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness – 218 Ohio Street – Map-Lot 032-089 – Thomas Hill Historic District – Applicant: Blackstone Restoration – Owner: Bangor Children’s

Home DBA The Hilltop School – Approval requested for Certificate of Appropriateness at property located at 218 Ohio Street for the removal of a portion of the modern southwest porch balustrade to facilitate the construction of an ADA compliant wheelchair ramp. The ramp will be constructed of ground contact pressure treated lumber and will be painted to match the structure. The property is located at Map-Lot 032-089, in the Thomas Hill Historic District. Owner: Bangor Children's Home DBA The Hilltop School.

Chair King introduced the agenda item.

Commissioner Coe asked for clarification if they need to vote on Commissioner Keebler's conflict of interest. Staff and Chair King confirmed they will not need to vote again.

Applicant Representative Nickerson presented to the podium previous approved changes and proposed changes to the site.

Chair King asked if the three pipes along the balcony would be removed. Applicant Representative Nickerson replied no. Commissioner Keebler asked what the pipes were for. Nickerson clarified.

Applicant Representative Nickerson informed the Commission they will not be painting the stairwell.

HPC Consultant confirmed this proposal is just for the installation of the ramp. Pullen confirmed with Applicant Representative Nickerson that the ramp will be painted.

Commissioner Coe asked if the angle from the picture is from the road. Applicant Representative Nickerson clarified that view was from the driveway and this cannot be seen from the street. Commissioner Keebler clarified this will be pressure treated wood.

Chair King opened the public comments – there were none.

Public comments closed.

Chair King asked the Commission if there were any questions – there were none.

Chair King asked if the ramp will have a non-skid material. Applicant Representative Nickerson confirmed it will.

Commissioner Coe moved that the Commission find that the application was deemed complete on April 16, 2026, that the proposed project is a Certificate of Appropriateness, and that the applicant paid all applicable fees. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Coe made the motion that Part 2, Section 1, 3, 6, 8, and part 3 in its entirety are not applicable. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Coe moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 3-7, the application satisfied Historic Preservation Code §148-9A requiring that any alteration of the historic structure will preserve or enhance its historical and architectural character. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Coe moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 3-7, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code §148-9B(2)(b) requiring that rehabilitation work does not destroy the distinguishing qualities nor character of the structure and its environment. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Coe moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 3-7, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code §148-9B(2)(d) requiring that distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize historic structures is not damaged or destroyed, wherever possible. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Coe moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 3-7, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code §148-9B(2)(e) requiring that the changes which have taken place in the course of time have acquired historic significance in their own right are retained and preserved wherever possible. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Coe moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 3-7, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code §148-9B(2)(g) requiring contemporary design for additions to only be approved if such design is compatible with the size, scale, material, and character of the neighborhood, structures, or its environment. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed

Commissioner Coe moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 3-7, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code §148-9B(2)(i) requiring that, wherever possible, all alterations to structures shall be done in such a manner that if they were to be removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the original structure would be unimpaired. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed

Commissioner Coe moved that the Commission finds that, based on the findings in Parts 1-2 of Section IV of this document, the Project meets the requirements for a Certificate of Appropriateness and therefore grants a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed Project. Seconded by Commissioner Keebler. Roll call voted conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

4. Draft ordinance changes

Chair King introduced the agenda item.

Planning Officer Collette presented the changes to the Historic Preservation Code.

Commissioner Keebler asked for clarity with the wording of the materials and read the following line “In the event that replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in color composition, design, texture and finish-other visual qualities and, where economically and technically feasible, materials.” Planning Officer Collette and Chair King discussed and clarified. Commissioner Coe and Sachs also added clarity. Keebler expressed concern with the drafted language for the above line because of redundancy in the terms “material”.

Member of the public, Rick Violette, handed the Commission and staff his drafted ordinance changes. Violette said he has a problem with the word “materials” and discussed. Violette added that he feels that applications should be reviewed based on past approvals from the HPC and asked for the criteria for to make someone replace in kind. Planning Officer Collette clarified that the Secretary of the Interior standards for substitute materials are in the drafted language and the addition of “where economically and technically feasible” guides that decision. Violette asked what economically feasibility means. Collette and Chair King clarified how this ordinance effects applications and how current applications are reviewed. King also added that HPC Consultant Pullen can provide professional explanations to buildings and building features.

Violette asked why other non-slate roofs were approved before previous applicant Steve Farren’s roof was denied. Commissioner Keebler responded those were different Commissions. Pullen explained character-defining features. Violette said applicants cannot read this ordinance and say what is character-defining. King clarified Pullen will give the interpretation of the character-defining features. Keebler expressed that is an issue many applicants have and the pre-application meeting was used to give the applicant the necessary information. Violette said he does not feel applicants should need to have pre-application meetings. Keebler discussed he feels the drafted changes adequately address Violette’s concerns. Pullen said the Secretary of Interior substitute material brief helps address this and using this language in the ordinance helps applicants. Chair King, Commissioner Keebler, Sachs, and Coe, HPC Consultant Pullen, Planning Officer Collette, and Rick Violette discussed at length.

5. Follow-up from previous meetings

Planning Officer Collette asked if the Commission has drafted any educational social media posts they would like to be posted.

The Commission has not drafted any post, but will.

6. Discuss next special meeting date

Staff and the Commission discussed the next special meeting date of July 23, 2026.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:37 P.M.

Historic Preservation Commission – Meeting Minutes
April 16th, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

Matt Altiero
Planning Analyst
Planning Division