



CITY OF BANGOR

# HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MEETING OF JUNE 25, 2026, 7:00 P.M.  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL  
73 HARLOW STREET

## AGENDA

### Old Business:

1. Meeting Minutes – June 11, 2026
2. Adopt Findings & Decisions for 43-49 Main Street

### New Business:

3. Discuss Character-Defining Features in the Historic Districts

### Other Business:

1. Schedule Next Special Meeting Date
2. Adjournment



# HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

CITY OF BANGOR

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MEETING OF JUNE 11, 2026, 7:00 P.M.  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL  
73 HARLOW STREET**

## **MEETING MINUTES**

### **Commission Members Present:**

Peter James Sachs  
Katie Coe  
Rebecca Krupke  
Nathaniel King

### **City Staff Present:**

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

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

---

### **Old Business:**

1. **Meeting Minutes** - May 14, 2026

Commissioner Coe moved to approve the May 14<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes. Commissioner Sachs seconded. All voting members in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

### **New Business:**

2. **Certificate of Appropriateness and Design Review – 43-49 Main Street – Map-Lot 042-107 – Main Street Historic District – Applicant/Owner: Rines, LLC** - The applicant, Rines, LLC, requests approval for Certificate of Appropriateness and Design Review at property located at 43-49 Main Street for the replacement of the stone-veneer base of a central damaged column and a portion of the façade. The applicant proposes installation of black granite stone-veneer to compliment the original stone material. The property is located at Map-Lot 042-107, in the Main Street Historic District. Owner/applicant: Rines, LLC.

Chair King introduced the agenda item.

Applicant Nick Mullins, co-owner of Rines, LLC, presented his proposed repairs and modifications at 43-49 Main Street. He emphasized his priority of balancing the building's original character with feasibility, as it remained challenging to find a match of the original marble. Due to material sourcing and cost considerations, he proposed the creation of an intentional black polish granite stone-veneer to repair the damaged pillar and bulkhead.

HPC Consultant Pullen reported on the historical significance of the site. He asked Applicant Mullins to clarify the width of the new materials and his plans to change the current green materials to black polish granite stone-veneer. Mullins answered that the new materials are similar to countertop width and confirmed the color change. Pullen explained that as long as the grills on the bulkhead are being preserved, he believes the character of the building is maintained with this project. Applicant Mullins responded that the grills are being preserved and he plans to conduct maintenance on the grills.

Commissioner Krupke asked how the potentially differing thickness between the original material and the new material might impact the cohesiveness of the project. Applicant Mullins responded that since bulkheads naturally flare out, any difference in thickness contributes to the intentional design feature. Krupke asked if only the damaged spots are being repaired or if the entire bulkhead is being replaced. Mullins explained the entire bulkhead will be replaced to ensure uniformity.

Chair King opened public comments. Seeing no public comments, Chair King closed public comment.

Chair King noted that he thinks the proposed project will look sharp, and he finds it to be a tasteful change. Commissioner Sachs and Coe agreed, saying the proposed project achieves the closest like-to-like match possible.

Applicant Mullins added he finds this approach to provide a good nod to the era of the architecture.

Chair King asked for elaboration on what treatment is set to be done to the cast iron grill. Applicant Mullins answered that the missing pieces are to be rewelded with cast iron, and any new repairs will be painted black to match the original color.

Commissioner Sachs moved to declare that the entirety of the procedural background has been met. Seconded by Commissioner Coe. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Coe moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1 and 4-5, 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 – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Sachs moved that the Commission finds Part 2, Sections 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 as well as Part 3, Sections 1, 2, and 3 not applicable to this application. Seconded by

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

Commissioner Coe moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1 and 4-5, 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 – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Sachs moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1 and 4-5, 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 Coe. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Commissioner Coe moved that the Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1 and 4-5, 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 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 and Design Review Permit for the proposed Project. Seconded by Commissioner Coe. Roll call vote conducted – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

Applicant Mullins asked about the timeline in receiving the Certificate of Appropriateness. Planning Officer Collette explained that it will need to be signed and finalized at the next Historic Preservation Commission meeting, but Mullins can now begin the project.

### **3. Parks Historic Designation Public Hearing**

Chair King introduced the agenda item.

Chair King opened the public hearing.

Ben Keller, a representative of a company that owns property adjacent to Broadway Park, asked about any impacts or restrictions on nearby property. Planning Officer Collette responded there will be no added restrictions.

Chair King closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Sachs brought forth concerns of added legal processes, causing him to oppose the designation. He explained how the parks have evolved since their original designs and is concerned the proposal prevents them from changing further. He expressed worry about how this might prevent the parks from expanding accessibility for wheelchairs and strollers.

HPC Consultant Pullen said he finds this designation to provide the opportunity for the Commission to be involved in proposals to the parks. Pullen added that the review process and standards would be the same as any other project brought to the HPC.

Commissioner Sachs expressed that if the Commission does not anticipate making changes to or preventing proposals at the parks, he is not sure proposals coming in front of the Commission would serve a purpose.

Commissioner Krupke shared that Bangor is unique because of the City's quantity of parks. Krupke expressed her priority of space preservation and hopes a historic designation would allow the Commission to protect the parks' space, such as preventing a road widening project from encroaching on the parks. Commissioner Coe added that while she supports infrastructure such as bathrooms to meet the needs of parkgoers, she is in favor of the designation in order to protect the space and potentially open new funding opportunities.

Chair King asked what type of proposals for parks would come to the Commission. He asked if new playground equipment would have to come before them. Planning Officer Collette directed the question back to the Commission, asking what scenarios they think are appropriate to be presented to them. Collette also added that projects that are submitted as minor revisions can be sent to the full Commission if they feel it needs more review.

Chair King expressed that the importance of the Commission is to protect cultural spaces, and that should include parks. Given the historical significance of the parks' designers and how people interact with the parks, he thinks the parks are worth protecting via this designation.

Commissioner Coe suggested that to address Commissioner Sachs' concerns, the ordinance should clarify what does not need to come before Commission to eliminate unnecessary burdens.

Chair King recommended that if a project is within its current footprint, it should not need to come to the Commission. King used the example that if playground equipment is being replaced within its current footprint, it should not need to be presented to the Commission, but if it were to expand beyond its current footprint it should. Planning Officer Collette agreed that more clarification could be added in the second round of ordinance amendments and noted that general maintenance is exempt from review.

Commissioner Sachs expressed concern about an increased burden on people who want to improve the park. Chair King responded that he does not believe the designation would increase strain. Commissioner Krupke acknowledged the importance of Commissioner Sachs' concern, emphasizing that the Commission should map out more thorough guidelines associated with the ordinance. King added that the designation will not change the use of the parks. Krupke highlighted the opportunity for land protection.

HPC Consultant Pullen said he believes making the parks a designated resource opens up more access to funds for park improvements. He expressed that it may provide opportunities to create signage about the history of the parks and elevate the importance of them to visitors and the state.

Chair King asked if a motion is required. Planning Officer Collette clarified a motion is required in order to recommend the designation to City Council.

Commissioner Sachs asked if the ordinance could be changed prior to making a motion. Planning Officer Collette responded that it could not be modified prior to a motion and encouraged adding the discussed clarifying language in the second round of ordinance modifications.

Commissioner Coe moved that the Commission sends this item to City Council and recommends that it ought to pass. Seconded by Commissioner Sachs. Roll call vote – 3 in favor, 1 opposed. Motion passed.

#### **4. Historic Preservation Ordinance Changes Public Hearing**

Chair King introduced the agenda item.

Planning Officer Collette noted that no changes have been made to the ordinance since the previous workshop. Collette responded to a submitted public comment, explaining that the City has not received additional CLG grants (besides the one in 2024 for \$15,000) since 2021 due to lack of staff time, but moving forward, she anticipates the ability to apply more regularly. Collette also plans to present ideas to the Commission for an upcoming fall CLG grant submission. Additionally, Collette explained there was no intention to make the ordinance more subjective with the changes; rather, she does not want to limit applicants by setting strict parameters on technical and economic feasibility. Collette added that the ordinance incorporates Secretary of Interior standards rather than guidelines. She suggested to incorporate a requirement for pre-application meetings to help the applicant with the proposal process in the second round of ordinance changes.

Commissioner Coe expressed concerns that a required pre-application meeting might create challenges for applicants who are unable to leave their jobs during business hours. Coe asked if there were alternative avenues for the meetings such as conducting them on Zoom. Planning Officer Collette clarified that pre-application meetings are available to be conducted on Zoom if the applicant prefers. Coe also pointed out that including a website link in the ordinance may incur challenges, such as the link expiring. Collette explained that she understood but wanted to directly provide reference materials.

Commissioner Krupke requested clarification on the discrepancy of whether the Commission hosted workshops surrounding this ordinance. Planning Officer Collette confirmed that a workshop did occur; however, none occurred after the proposed amendments were revised, which may be what the public comment is referencing.

Chair King advised to include language to ensure that the HPC's advisory consultant meets the Secretary of Interior professional standards in applicable disciplines. HPC Consultant Pullen mentioned that the National Park Service also has standards for this to reference.

HPC Consultant Pullen said that he believes it is helpful that the ordinance now provides a

definition for character-defining features.

Chair King referenced an example from the City of Portland that includes photographic examples of character defining features on historic buildings. He expressed excitement surrounding the community's interest and involvement with ordinance changes.

Chair King asked if a motion is required. Planning Officer Collette clarified a motion is required in order to recommend the ordinance changes to City Council.

Commissioner Sachs moved that the Commission recommends that the included changes to Chapter 148, Historic Preservation Code, to City Council ought to pass. Seconded by Commissioner Coe. Roll call vote – all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

## **5. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 7:58 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Kayleigh Rienas  
Development Assistant  
Planning Division



# COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**CITY OF BANGOR**

PLANNING DIVISION

June 25, 2026

## **Bangor Historic Preservation Commission Findings and Decision**

<b>Applicant/Owner:</b>	Rines, LLC 47 Main St Suite 200 Bangor, Maine 04401
<b>Property Address:</b>	43-49 Main St, Map-Lot 042-107
<b>Zoning District:</b>	Downtown Development District (DDD)
<b>Permit Request:</b>	Certificate of Appropriateness and Design Review
<b>Designation:</b>	Main Street Historic District
<b>Description:</b>	Repairing stone-veneer base of a central damaged column and a portion of the façade with proposed black granite stone-veneer
<b>Public Hearing Date:</b>	June 11, 2026
<b>Permitting Requirements:</b>	§148-9(A), §148-9(B), §71-8
<b>Commission Members Present:</b>	Nathaniel King, Peter James Sachs, Katie Coe, Rebecca Krupke
<b>Commission Vote:</b>	Motion carried 4 to 0 to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness and Design Review Permit.

### **I. The Record**

The Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the following exhibits:

1. Certificate of Appropriateness and Design Review application, including photo exhibits, submitted by applicant on 05.13.2026
2. Proof of payment, received on 05.13.2026

3. Consultant’s memo, received from HPC Consultant Mike Pullen on 06.02.2026
4. Applicant response to questions and comments, received via email on 06.03.2026
5. Additional applicant response to questions and comments, received via email on 06.03.2026
6. List of abutters within 100ft of the subject property
7. Public notice sent to abutters within 100ft of the subject property on 06.02.2026
8. Notice of mailing, received via email from City Print Foreman on 06.03.2026

## **II. Project Description and Permit Requirements**

The project proposes the repair of damaged façade and stone-veneer base of a central pillar. The applicant proposes installation of black granite stone-veneer to compliment the original stone material. As an alteration to the exterior appearance of a building in a historic district, the proposed development must meet the requirements for a Certificate of Appropriateness (§148-8). Since the building is also located in the Bangor Center Revitalization Area, it must also receive a Design Review permit; however, any project that receives a Certificate of Appropriateness is automatically granted a Design Review permit.

## **III. Procedural Background**

1. The Application was deemed complete on June 11, 2026.
2. The proposed Project is a Certificate of Appropriateness and Design Review.
3. The applicant paid all applicable fees (Exhibit 2).

## **IV. Applicable Provisions and Findings**

### **Part 1 – The Project meets the Evaluation Standards of §148-9A regarding general standards.**

1. The Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1 and 4-5, 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.

### **Part 2 – The Project meets the Evaluation Standards of §148-9B regarding renovations, alterations and repairs.**

1. The Commission finds that Historic Preservation Code § 148-9B(2)(a) is not applicable.
2. The Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1 and 4-5, 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.

3. The Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1 and 4-5, 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.
4. The Commission finds that, based on Exhibits 1 and 4-5, 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.
5. The Commission finds that Historic Preservation Code § 148-9B(2)(e) is not applicable.
6. The Commission finds that Historic Preservation Code § 148-9B(2)(f) is not applicable.
7. The Commission finds that Historic Preservation Code § 148-9B(2)(g) is not applicable.
8. The Commission finds that Historic Preservation Code § 148-9B(2)(h) is not applicable.
9. The Commission finds that Historic Preservation Code § 148-9B(2)(i) is not applicable.

**Part 3 – The Project meets the Exceptional Circumstances Standards of §148-9E.**

The Commission finds that standards of §148-9E are not applicable.

**V. Decision**

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.

**VI. General Permit Requirements:**

- A. This permit does not relieve the applicant from any other state or federal permits that may be required for the project.

- B. The proposed construction, reconstruction, alteration, moving or demolition must be begun within 6 months of approval and completed within 12 months of approval, unless the Commission sets other time limits. An extension or extensions of up to one year in total length may be granted as a minor alteration or revision under § 148-8B.C.
- C. After completion of the project, or after 12 months from the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness permit, the property owner shall allow staff to access exterior areas of the property as reasonably necessary in order to perform an inspection to verify work was done in accordance with the Commission's approval.
- D. Any person, firm or corporation being the actual or constructive owner of any building or premises which is adjudged to be in violation of any of the provisions of this chapter shall be guilty of a civil violation and, on conviction, shall be fined not less than \$10 nor more than \$100. Each day such a violation is permitted to exist after notification shall constitute a separate offense. Any fines imposed pursuant to this chapter shall inure to the benefit of the City of Bangor.

If you should have any questions or desire further information, please do not hesitate to give the Planning Division a call at 207.992.4280.

Sincerely,

City of Bangor Historic Preservation Commission

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

CC: City of Bangor Planning Division  
City of Bangor Code Enforcement Division