



HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

CITY OF BANGOR

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MEETING OF AUGUST 13, 2026, 7:00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL
73 HARLOW STREET

MEETING MINUTES

Commission Members Present:

Nathaniel King
Katie Coe
Matthew Weitkamp
Peter Keebler
Rebecca Krupke
Peter Sachs

City Staff Present:

Anja Collette, Planning Officer
Matt Altiero, Planning Analyst
Mike Pullen, HPC Consultant

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

Old Business:

1. Meeting Minutes – July 9, 2026

Commissioner Sachs moved to approve the July 9th meeting minutes. Seconded by Commissioner Krupke. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

2. Adoption of Findings & Decision for 30 Central Street

Commissioner Sachs moved to adopt the findings and decisions for 30 Central Street. Seconded by Commissioner Krupke. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

New Business:

3. Certificate of Appropriateness and Design Review – 73 Main Street – Map-Lot 041-066 – Main Street Historic District – Applicant: Roscoe Witham - Owner: Cook

Investment Group LLC - The applicant, Roscoe Witham, requests approval for Certificate of Appropriateness and Design Review at property located at 73 Main Street for the replacement of siding panels with brick veneer and replacement of tiles on the underside of the awning with in-kind materials. Additionally, the applicant proposes an installation of two walk-up sliding service windows facing Cross Street. The property is located at Map-Lot 042-106 in the Main Street Historic District. Applicant: Roscoe Witham. Owner: Cook Investment Group LLC.

Chair King introduced the agenda item.

Applicant Representative Roscoe Witham presented to the podium.

HPC Consultant Pullen discussed the building's history, sharing that the circa 1928 Coe Building was designed by architects Crowell and Lancaster.

HPC Consultant Pullen asked if the project rendering displays a newly painted soffit – Applicant Representative Witham responded that if pieces of the soffit are unable to be replaced, they will be painted white.

HPC Consultant Pullen discussed the metal moldings on the window perimeters that clamp onto existing metal panels. He asked if this is to remain with the newly installed faux brick panels. Applicant Representative Witham responded that the windows will have a J channel that will meet up to the brick.

Chair King asked the Commission for questions.

Commissioner Keebler asked if the faux brick is vinyl – Applicant Representative Witham responded the material is similar to vinyl but offers more sturdiness. Keebler asked if the faux brick is the same size as rest of the building's brick – Witham confirmed.

Commissioner Krupke asked to see a sample – Applicant Representative Witham provided an image.

Commissioner Krupke asked about a remaining square box panel – Applicant Representative Witham shared it is believed to have been an alarm for the former jewelry store. HPC Consultant Pullen requested removal if it is no longer operational – Applicant Representative Witham confirmed he would like to remove it.

Commissioner Keebler expressed he appreciates the approach and asked what material is under the current exterior. Applicant Representative Witham responded 3/4 inch plywood.

Commissioner Krupke expressed support for the proposed service windows.

Commissioner Sachs asked if language needed to be added surrounding the removal of the square box panel. HPC Consultant Pullen shared that it will be recorded in the minutes. Planning Officer Collette recommended including it in the decision, as Code Enforcement primarily references the decision letter.

Chair King opened public comment – there were none. Public comment closed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the procedural background was appropriately fulfilled. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that Part 2, Sections 3, 5, 6, and 8, as well as

Historic Preservation Commission – Meeting Minutes
August 13th, 2026

Part 3, Sections 1, 2, and 3, are not applicable to this application. Seconded by Commissioner Krupke. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1 and 2, 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. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1 and 2, 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 Sachs. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1 and 2, 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 Sachs. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1 and 2, 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. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1 and 2, 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 Sachs. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1 and 2, 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. All voting members 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 and Design Review Permit for the proposed Project, with the condition that the square box panel above the second window be removed if at all possible, and if not possible to remove, be painted in like color to its surrounding wall. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

- 4. Certificate of Appropriateness and Design Review – 139 Main Street – Map-Lot 042-130 – Main Street Historic District – Applicant: Renewal by Anderson - Owner: Ryan York** - The applicant, Renewal by Anderson, requests approval for Certificate of Appropriateness and Design Review at property located at 139 Main Street for the replacement of three windows and one entry door with in-kind materials. The property is located at Map-Lot 042-130 in the Main Street Historic District. Applicant: Renewal by Anderson. Owner: Ryan York

Historic Preservation Commission – Meeting Minutes
August 13th, 2026

Chair King introduced the agenda item.

Applicant Representative Caitlyn Arellano presented to the podium.

HPC Consultant Pullen discussed the building's history, sharing the William Lewis Heirs Building was constructed between 1858 and 1859. He noted the Romanesque arched masonry details on the front façade.

HPC Consultant Pullen asked whether the glass area in all replacement windows and doors will match the original dimensions – Applicant Representative Arellano confirmed. Pullen shared that the windows are costume made and no fillers are planned around the perimeters.

HPC Consultant Pullen asked whether the divided light muntin grills include interior and exterior grills and a dark spacer between the glass panes, and whether the new muntins will match the narrow width of those existing. Applicant Representative Arellano responded that the new materials will be the same size, configuration, and color as the current materials.

HPC Consultant Pullen asked whether the exterior storm panels will be removed – Applicant Representative Arellano confirmed there is no longer need for the storm windows.

HPC Consultant Pullen asked whether the exterior trim around the windows will be painted black – Applicant Representative Arellano responded the trim will not be touched or altered.

HPC Consultant Pullen asked whether the diamond leaded windows will remain unaltered – Applicant Representative Arellano confirmed.

Commissioner Keebler asked what materials are being used – Applicant Representative Arellano responded fibrex, a hybrid material designed to withstand and prevent fading. Keebler asked if the windows are impregnated with the black color – Arellano confirmed.

HPC Consultant Pullen asked whether the glass would be tinted or clear – Applicant Representative Arellano responded clear.

Commissioner Keebler asked about the double pane windows – Applicant Representative Arellano described they will use an insert frame that is not visible from outside. Keebler commented the project is as close as the applicant can accomplish to like materials and creates better sealing.

Chair King opened public comment – there were none. Public comment closed.

Commissioner Coe moved that the application was deemed complete on August 13, 2026, the proposed project is a Certificate of Appropriateness and Design Review, and the applicant paid all applicable fees. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1-6, 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. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that Part 2, Section 1, 5, 6, 7, and 8, and Part 3, Sections 1, 2, and 3, are not applicable to this application. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Historic Preservation Commission – Meeting Minutes
August 13th, 2026

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1-6, 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 Sachs. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1-6, the application satisfies Historic Preservation Code § 148-9B(2)(c) requiring that, while repair is preferable to replacement, in the event that replacement of deteriorate architectural features is necessary, the feature being replaced in color, design, texture and other visual qualities and, where economically and technically feasible, materials. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1-6, 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. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Keebler moved that The Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1-6, 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. All voting members 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 and Design Review for the proposed Project. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

5. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:33 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Kayleigh Rienas
Development Assistant
Planning Division