



CITY OF BANGOR

# HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MEETING OF JANUARY 8, 2026, 7:00 P.M.  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL  
73 HARLOW STREET**

## **MEETING MINUTES**

### **Commission Members Present:**

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

### **City Staff Present:**

Matt Altiero, Planning Analyst  
Anja Collette, Planning Officer  
Mike Pullen, HPC Consultant  
David Szewczyk, City Solicitor

Planning Officer Anja Collette called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

---

## **1. Election of Officers**

Planning Officer Anja Collette presented the agenda item and gave an overview of the nomination & election process.

Commissioner Krupke nominated Commissioner King for the office of Chair. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Commissioner King elected to the office of Chair.

Chair King nominated Commissioner Krupke for the office of Vice Chair. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Commissioner Krupke elected to the office of Vice Chair.

Chair King made his introduction. King also appointed Alternate Member Weitkamp as a voting member at tonight's meeting.

Alternate Member Keebler asked to add an agenda item for a discussion on meeting frequency – Chair King agreed to add this to the end of the meeting.

## **Old Business:**

**2. Meeting Minutes** – December 11, 2025 – *Postponed*

Chair King introduced the agenda item and confirmed that approval of these minutes will be postponed to the next meeting.

**3. Certificate of Appropriateness – 62 High Street – Map-Lot 042-102 – High Street Historic District – Applicant: Tyler Smith – Owner: Gilpin Holdings, LLC** - Approval requested for Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of rotted trim boards and replacement with white PVC boards. The property is located at Map-Lot 042-102, in the High Street Historic District.

Chair King introduced the agenda item.

Applicant Representative Louie Morrison and Property Owner Zach Gilpin presented to the podium and provided an overview of the application.

HPC Consultant Mike Pullen presented an overview of his written memo on the application and discussed with Applicant Representative Morrison.

Alternate Member Keebler asked to clarify the procedure for requesting possible amendments to the application – Planning Officer Anja Collette responded and clarified.

Alternate Member Weitkamp asked if there had been any existing aluminum gutter at the time the property was purchased – Applicant Representative Morrison and Property Owner Gilpin responded and clarified what had been existing, as well as what currently remains.

Alternate Member Keebler brought up the issue of applicants often seeking retroactive approval of work already completed – discussed at length with Applicant Representative Morrison and Property Owner Gilpin. Vice Chair Krupke asked about Code Enforcement participation in the process – Planning Officer Collette responded that she will discuss with staff. Commissioners discussed the issue of buyers not being aware of a property's historic status at length with Collette and Morrison.

Commissioner Coe asked for clarification regarding property owners completing repairs with in-kind materials – Planning Officer Collette responded and clarified this process.

Alternate Member Weitkamp also brought up the issue of the Commission requesting amendments to an application and applicants then not following up on these amendments and re-submitting their applications.

Chair King opened the public comments – there were none. Public comments closed.

Vice Chair Krupke asked for clarification regarding the recommendation that gutters be added – Planning Officer Collette responded and clarified. Alternate Members Keebler and Weitkamp discussed.

Alternate Members Keebler and Weitkamp discussed the design standards for this property due to its status on the National Historic Register. Applicant Representative Morrison confirmed that there was no existing gutter on the building.

Commissioner Sachs mentioned that existing damage on the building was not in the interest of historic preservation. Discussed with Alternate Member Keebler, Chair King, and Applicant Representative Morrison.

Historic Preservation Commission – Meeting Minutes  
January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2025

Chair King reiterated that the issue of gutters is not part of the current application review. Discussed with Alternate Member Keebler.

Vice Chair Krupke asked for clarification regarding work done on the cornices – Property Owner Gilpin responded and clarified. Discussed with Alternate Member Keebler.

Chair King clarified the process for voting on the review standards with Planning Officer Collette.

Alternate Member Weitkamp moved that the Commission find that the application was deemed complete on December 11, 2025, the applicant paid all applicable fees, and the proposed project is a Certificate of Appropriateness. Seconded by Vice Chair Krupke. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed.

Commissioner Sachs asked for clarification regarding the first design standard – Chair King responded and clarified.

Alternate Member Weitkamp moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 2-5, 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 – none in favor, all opposed. Motion failed.

Alternate Member Weitkamp moved that the Commission does not find 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 Sachs. Roll call vote conducted – none in favor, all opposed. Motion failed.

Commissioner Coe 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 Alternate Member Weitkamp. Roll call vote conducted – none in favor, all opposed. Motion failed.

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 Alternate Member Weitkamp. Roll call vote conducted – 3 in favor (Commissioners Sachs and Coe and Chair King), 2 opposed (Vice Chair Krupke and Alternate Member Weitkamp). Motion passed.

Commissioner Coe 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. Motion not seconded. Alternate Member Weitkamp moved that the Commission find this standard not applicable in this case. Seconded by Commissioner Coe. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Coe moved that Historic Preservation Code § 148-9B(2)(f) requiring that alterations to an historic building to create an earlier appearance not be undertaken, except when qualifying as restoration under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Restoration, is not applicable in this case. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Sachs moved that the Commission finds that, based on 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 Alternate Member Weitkamp. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Sachs moved that the Commission finds that the project meets the requirements for Certificate of Appropriateness and therefore grants a Certificate of Appropriateness permit for the proposed Project. Seconded by Alternate Member Weitkamp. Roll call vote conducted – 3 in favor (Vice Chair Krupke, Commissioner Sachs, and Chair Chernesky), 2 opposed (Alternate Member Weitkamp and Commissioner Coe). Motion failed as 4 affirmative votes are required to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

## **Other Business:**

### **4. Annual Training – Planning, Legal, and Mike Pullen (Advisory Consultant)**

City Solicitor David Szewczyk presented to the Commission and provided their annual Legal training.

Alternate Member Weitkamp asked about retention of records for the purposes of FOAA – City Solicitor Szewczyk responded and clarified that there are different requirements depending on the type of record.

Alternate Member Keebler asked about executive sessions – City Solicitor Szewczyk responded and clarified.

Alternate Member Weitkamp asked about being in receipt of evidence that has not yet been publicly available – City Solicitor Szewczyk responded and clarified that any such evidence should immediately be forwarded to City staff.

Alternate Member Keebler asked for clarification regarding quorum and the number of members required to pass certain items – City Solicitor Szewczyk responded and clarified. Keebler asked about changing the number required to meet quorum – Planning Officer Anja Collette responded and discussed.

Alternate Member Keebler asked for clarification regarding motions – City Solicitor Szewczyk responded and clarified. Keebler and Szewczyk discussed with Chair King.

HPC Consultant Mike Pullen asked for clarification regarding the vote on the final decision for the application reviewed at this meeting (62 High Street) – City Solicitor Szewczyk responded and clarified. Chair King asked for additional clarification about voting on standards and final decisions – Szewczyk responded and discussed at length with Commissioners and Planning Officer Collette.

Alternate Member Keebler asked for clarification regarding conflicts of interest, specifically regarding a prior determination on this point – City Solicitor Szewczyk responded and discussed at length with Keebler and the rest of the Commission.

Chair King asked about the applicability of a particular standard in regards to the application reviewed at this meeting (62 High Street) and why it wasn't in the decision letter. Planning Officer Collette responded that she didn't believe it was applicable, but if the Commission feels a standard is applicable to an application but is not in the decision letter, they can vote to add it.

Historic Preservation Commission – Meeting Minutes  
January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2025

Alternate Member Weitkamp asked about consistently having Legal staff at Commission meetings – City Solicitor Szewczyk responded and discussed; noted that they can be at meetings as requested. Commissioner Coe asked if they can attend the next meeting – Szewczyk agreed.

Alternate Member Keebler asked about the term “reasonable return” in regards to determining economic hardship – City Solicitor Szewczyk responded and clarified. Commissioners continued to discuss at length with Szewczyk and Planning Officer Collette.

Applicant Representative Morrison asked for clarification about §148-9E, Exceptional Circumstances. Planning Officer Collette responded and clarified. Applicant Representative Morrison explained that if this project was not complete, the structure would not be habitable which would cause economic and unreasonable hardship on the applicant. Morrison also explained the conditions and circumstances were not caused or created by the applicant as he had recently purchased the property.

Chair King and Commissioner Sachs asked for additional clarification regarding the Commission’s ability to reconsider a vote – Planning Officer Collette and City Solicitor Szewczyk responded and clarified, and discussed at length with Commissioners.

Commissioner Coe moved to reconsider the final decision for the 62 High Street application – discussed this motion at length with City Solicitor Szewczyk. Coe withdrew the motion.

Alternate Member Weitkamp moved to continue the remainder of the training and Commission discussions to the February 12, 2026 meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Coe. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

## **5. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 9:26 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Maquillan  
Development Assistant  
Planning Division