

3225 MAIN STREET • P.O. BOX 226
BARNSTABLE, MASSACHUSETTS 02630



CAPE COD
COMMISSION

(508) 362-3828 • Fax (508) 362-3136 • www.capecodcommission.org

Minutes
Springhill Suites by Marriott (TR14017) Meeting
July 30, 2015
Innovation Room, Barnstable County Strategic Information Office
3195 Main Street, Barnstable, Massachusetts

Subcommittee Members Present: Ernest Virgilio (Chair), Mary Pat Flynn, John D. Harris, John McCormack, Jr., Richard Roy, and Charles McCaffrey (Alternate)

Commission Staff Present: Paul Niedzwiecki (Executive Director), Jonathon Idman (Chief Regulatory Officer), Sarah Korjeff (Historic Preservation Specialist), Garry Meus (Landscape Architecture and Design Specialist), Elizabeth Perry (Regulatory Officer II), Jeffrey Ribeiro (Regulatory Officer II), Steven Tupper (Technical Services Planner), and Jessica Wielgus (Commission Counsel)

Others Present: Atty. Kevin Eriksen (Counsel, Falmouth Hospitality LLC) and Robert Walker (Principal, Falmouth Hospitality LLC)

Minutes Summary

The Cape Cod Commission (Commission) Springhill Suites by Marriott Subcommittee (Subcommittee) held a meeting to review a proposal by Falmouth Hospitality LLC (Applicant) to construct a 110-room hotel as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI). The Subcommittee discussed the project, made findings, and instructed Commission staff to prepare a draft DRI decision consistent with those findings.

Documents Used

1. Memorandum from Commission staff, dated 7/29/15

Public Meeting

Ernest Virgilio, Chair, convened a public meeting at 2:04pm. He said that all five full members of the Subcommittee were present, having quorum. He asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the July 9, 2015 public hearing. John Harris moved, and Richard Roy seconded. All were in favor. Mr. Virgilio asked Jonathon Idman, Chief Regulatory Officer, for comments.

Mr. Idman reminded the Subcommittee members not to participate in any ex parte communication. He said the Subcommittee will be asked to take votes during the meeting, and Charles McCaffrey cannot vote or deliberate on a motion as an alternate member of the Subcommittee. *(Note: Mr. McCaffrey did not participate in any of the votes or deliberation referenced herein.)* He said Subcommittee members should continually check the SharePoint website for new materials. He said that Commission staff had prepared a memorandum, dated 7/29/15, that outlined the matters to be discussed by the Subcommittee at the meeting. He said the Subcommittee should vote on Regional Policy Plan (RPP) consistency, benefits and detriments, and whether the probably project benefit outweighs the probably project detriment. He said the Subcommittee should then vote to instruct staff to draft a decision consistent with those votes.

Mr. Idman went over the memorandum, specifically Commission staff's opinion that the project meets the Heritage Preservation/Community Character (HPCC) Minimum Performance Standards (MPS) of the RPP. He asked Sarah Korjeff, Historic Preservation Specialist, for comment.

Ms. Korjeff said that the contents of the memorandum were consistent with the Commission's staff report and her previous presentations on the project. She said she is available if the Subcommittee has any questions for her.

Mr. Virgilio asked for questions from the Subcommittee. John McCormack, Jr. said that the project's consistency with the RPP was clear in the staff report. He said that Cape Cod should not be a historic museum.

Mr. McCaffrey said that he disagrees with the opinions of the staff report. He said the project is not consistent with the goals of the Business Redevelopment District zoning because it is not a mixed use. Mr. Idman replied that the memorandum suggest the design is consistent with the intent of the zoning district in its physical design. Mr. McCaffrey said that should be made clear.

Mr. McCaffrey said that the project site is located in a distinctive area, specifically "Falmouth Main Street", which he stated runs from Palmer Avenue to Davis Straits.

Mr. McCormack said that it should be considered significant that commercial accommodations are allowed by special permit in the local zoning. Mr. McCaffrey said that commercial accommodations are allowed in almost all districts in Falmouth. He said the special permit requirement should be considered differently in this district than in other business districts.

Mr. Virgilio asked Mr. McCormack for clarification on his understanding of the different business districts in Falmouth. Mr. McCaffrey said there are four different business districts with their own requirements. Mr. Virgilio said that this development seems consistent with other recent development in the area.

Jeffrey Ribeiro, Regulatory Officer, noted that the Subcommittee should consider Commission regulations in forming its opinion, and that local boards can and will render decision sunder applicable local by-laws. Mr. McCormack said that the Subcommittee should not be the arbiter

of the intent of a Town's by-laws. Mr. Virgilio agreed that the Subcommittee should focus on the matters before the Commission, and not local matters that will be taken up by local permitting boards. He said that Town boards will have their own permitting.

Mr. McCaffrey said that the benefits and detriments should be changed based on that opinion. Mr. Ribeiro said that the Subcommittee would get to the suggested benefits and detriments later in the discussion. He reminded the Subcommittee that the language in the memorandum is not that suggested by Commission staff, but rather by the applicant and by public testimony.

Mr. McCaffrey said the glass design of the pedestrian bridge is appropriate to distinguish the massings of the two buildings. He said he was unsure how the spandrel glass panels would appear on the final building. He said the rest of the building should utilize more natural materials. He said vinyl/fiberglass railings and vinyl shutters should not be allowed because they do not appear to be made of natural materials. He said the build being entirely clad in manmade materials affects the character of the building. He said the use of natural cedar shingles on the sides of the building would reduce the mass of the building.

Mr. McCaffrey said the proportions of the shutters are not acceptable. He said that the shutters should be removed entirely if they are not improved. He said the inaccessible balconies of the building hurt the integrity of the building. He asked for input from Ms. Korjeff. Ms. Korjeff said the Subcommittee should first decide if the project meets the MPS of the RPP before discussing any potential conditions. Ms. Korjeff suggested the Subcommittee could require either high quality manmade materials or some use of natural materials, with Commission staff review of those materials. She said that the Subcommittee must explain their reasoning for imposing conditions related to the use of natural materials in place of what the applicant currently proposes.

Mr. Idman asked the Subcommittee which materials listed on the application materials are inadequate. Mr. McCaffrey suggested the shutters are not adequate. Ms. Korjeff said that non-operational shutters are not an important part of the design. She suggested that the Subcommittee could ask for a rendering of the building without the shutters, perhaps with a more pronounced white window trim detail.

Mr. McCaffrey asked for the opinion of other Subcommittee members. Mr. McCormack said the shutters help break up the façade, and the materials will be adequate as viewed from the street. He said the design as proposed meets the MPS of the RPP. He said the Subcommittee should not design the project for the applicant. Mr. Virgilio said that he has worked with the materials proposed, and he has found them acceptable in appearance. He said the strength and durability of the proposed materials is a good reason to justify their use in this project, and he also feels they meet the MPS. Mr. Virgilio asked the Subcommittee if they would like to discuss each material proposed individually.

Mr. Idman said that the Subcommittee should consider the applicant's stated reason for using the materials proposed, and the materials contribute to the LEED-certifiability of the project. Jessica Wielgus, Commission Counsel, said that she cautions the Subcommittee not to redesign the project but to rather consider if the proposed design meets the MPS. She said that as Ms.

Korjeff said the Subcommittee must determine whether the project meets the MPS as designed before requiring any conditions of the applicant.

Mr. McCaffrey asked for clarifications on the MPS. Mr. Idman said that the materials proposed have advanced since the 2009 RPP was drafted. He said the Subcommittee should consider if the proposed materials meet the intent of the standard. Mr. McCaffrey said he agrees that composite materials can be used sometimes, but the materials proposed will have an effect on the character of the surrounding area. Ms. Korjeff said the intent and interpretation of the MPSs is to consider metal or glass clad buildings as “non-traditional” finishes and composite materials that resemble natural wood materials as “traditional.” Ms. Korjeff noted the term “natural materials” does not appear in the RPP. Mr. Virgilio asked for clarification on whether natural materials would be required in any contexts. Ms. Korjeff required that projects in some historic districts and projects involving historic structures may require natural materials, but the materials proposed are consistent with treatments allowed in similar contexts within the region.

Mary Pat Flynn said the building uses too much of the lot, leaving little space for trees.

Mr. Ribeiro clarified that the project is not located within a local historic district. He said the immediate context of the building is shown on the survey prepared by Commission staff, dated 7/23/15.

Mr. Idman suggested the Subcommittee should vote on consistency with the MPS. Mr. McCormack moved to find the project as proposed is consistent with the RPP HPCC-MPS as set out in the staff memorandum dated 7/29/15.

Mr. McCaffrey asked if the green screen could be extended along the west façade. He said the applicant is relying on screening from trees not under its control. Mr. Idman said that the Subcommittee could impose such a condition. Mr. McCormack said the Subcommittee should not try to predict what screening may be removed in the future. Mr. Virgilio asked for further discussion or motions from members of the Subcommittee. Ms. Flynn said much of the plantings on the site would come down as part of the project. Mr. Idman said the green screen is important under the MPSs because it screens the parking, which is a requirement of the MPSs. Ms. Korjeff said the memorandum contains suggested conditions regarding the green screen and the potential for Commission staff review of materials.

Mr. McCormack noted that his motion included those recommended conditions as it reflected the memorandum. Mr. Roy asked for clarification of the photo of the green screen shown on the materials. Ms. Korjeff replied that was simply a photo of an example green screen on another project, not a photo rendering of what the green screen would look like on this project. Mr. Ribeiro added that the photo is of the particular green screen product proposed by the applicant, however.

Mr. Roy said the screen should be extended. He asked about screening to the rear. Mr. Idman replied that significant planting buffer was proposed at the rear.

Mr. Harris asked for the motion to be restated. Mr. McCormack restated his motion. Mr. Harris seconded. Ms. Flynn asked if town boards were bound by our decision and its findings. Mr. Idman said the town is not bound by our decision in any way. Mr. Virgilio called for a vote and all were in favor.

Probable Project Benefits and Detriments

Mr. Idman said the Subcommittee should now vote on adopting benefits and detriments, potentially including but not limited to those suggested in the memorandum dated 7/29/15.

Mr. Virgilio read the first benefit, that the project furthers the Town's goal of redeveloping Main Street. Mr. Harris asked for clarification on the Town's redevelopment goals. Ms. Flynn summarized the Town's redevelopment actions. Mr. Roy asked for clarification on the extent of the Business Redevelopment district. Mr. Ribeiro stated the bounds of the district. Mr. Roy moved to adopt the benefit, and Mr. McCormack seconded. All were in favor.

Mr. Virgilio read the second benefit, that the project would redevelop a blighted site. Mr. McCaffrey and Ms. Flynn said the project is better than what is currently there. Mr. McCormack moved to adopt the benefit, and Mr. Harris seconded. All were in favor.

Mr. McCormack moved that the third benefit be adopted. Mr. McCaffrey asked to make a comment before the motion was seconded. Mr. Virgilio read the benefit, which was that the project would make pedestrian improvements as required by the DRI Scoping decision. Mr. McCormack moved and Mr. Harris seconded. All were in favor.

Mr. Virgilio read the fourth benefit, that the project would increase travel to the region through business and leisure travelers. Mr. Virgilio said it was likely to do so, and accommodations for business travelers are needed. Mr. McCormack said the Marriott Corporation conducted due diligence that the project is needed. Mr. McCaffrey said there is an existing hotel largely vacant nearby. Mr. Idman said the statute uses the term "probable" project benefit, and the Subcommittee should use its judgment about whether a benefit is likely or probable to be realized from a project. Mr. Harris asked if there is a statement from the town desiring further commercial accommodations. Mr. Idman said he did not know of a statement on commercial accommodations in the Town's Local Comprehensive Plan (LCP), and that there had been no statement on the project from the local chamber of commerce. Mr. Roy moved that the benefit be adopted to say that the project would create additional commercial accommodations, and Mr. McCormack seconded. All were in favor.

Mr. Virgilio read the fifth benefit, that the project would employ local contractors. He said he has seen recent projects on the Cape that use all off-Cape contractors, especially for construction. Mr. McCaffrey said that the project may employ some local contractors, but it is not probable that it would employ primarily local contractors, and the applicant is not required to use any local contractors. Mr. Roy said nothing in the materials substantiated the claim the applicant would employ local contractors. Mr. Idman said past projects had imposed conditions that local contractors be used if the applicant suggested such a benefit, and Commission were to adopt such a project benefit, and the Subcommittee could ask the applicant about such a

condition as it was present. Mr. Virgilio asked Robert Walker, Falmouth Hospitality LLC Principal, for comment. Mr. Walker said projects will likely be bid to local contractors, but he could not guarantee who would be selected. He said the development team would utilize local businesses while visiting the site. Mr. Walker said that, in other projects he has done, using local maintenance contractors was more cost effective. Mr. McCormack said the benefit was not probable. Mr. McCaffrey suggested the benefit be worded that the project may employ some local contractors. Mr. McCormack moved to adopt the benefit as suggested by Mr. McCaffrey, and Mr. Roy seconded. All were in favor.

Mr. Virgilio read the sixth benefit, that the project would improvement stormwater issues on site and off site. Mr. Roy said the benefit was accurate and moved to adopt it, and Mr. McCormack seconded. All were in favor.

Mr. Virgilio read the seventh benefit, that the project would create year round jobs. Mr. Idman noted there is a corresponding detriment related to expected wages for those primarily service jobs. Mr. Harris moved to adopt the benefit, and Mr. McCormack seconded. All were in favor.

Mr. Virgilio read the eighth benefit, that the project will have a positive impact on local businesses. Mr. Roy said hotel visitors would utilize local shops and restaurants. Mr. Virgilio moved to adopt the benefit with additional language that those staying at the hotel would likely spend money at restaurants and shops on Main Street, and Mr. Roy seconded. All were in favor.

Mr. Virgilio read the ninth benefit, that the project is consistent with the goals of the Business Redevelopment district. Mr. McCaffrey said the sentiment had already been expressed in the first benefit. Mr. McCormack moved to adopt the benefit with the clarification that the project is consistent with some of the goals of the Business Redevelopment district. Mr. Virgilio seconded. All were in favor.

Mr. Virgilio read the tenth benefit, that the project would increase property and room tax revenue to the Town, which would assist the Town in further capital and infrastructure projects. Mr. McCaffrey said he would not include any suggestion of how the revenues would be used. He said the hotel was unlikely to hurt the business of other commercial accommodations. Mr. McCormack moved to adopt the benefit without any suggestion as to how the revenues would be used, and Mr. Roy seconded. All were in favor.

Mr. Idman asked for any other probable project benefits. Mr. Virgilio said the applicant should think about making the project available for use during emergency situations. Ms. Wielgus asked if there was anything in the record to substantiate including this benefit. Mr. Roy agreed with Mr. Virgilio, but said there had been nothing to suggest that by the applicant. Mr. Idman said emergency preparedness could be considered in the future in an RPP update. Mr. McCormack suggested it be discussed at meetings concerning the update to the RPP.

Mr. Virgilio read the first detriment, that the project would detrimentally impact community character through its size. He said the issue had been covered during the discussion of MPS consistency, and he did not find the project's size to be a detriment. Mr. Idman said the RPP does not have an outright limit on the size of projects or buildings.

Mr. McCaffrey said the Subcommittee had heard from the public that the project is not consistent with local development patterns, that the quality of the design is not good enough for Falmouth, and that a smaller and better designed building would be better suited for the site. Ms. Flynn asked Mr. McCaffrey if he thought the project is inconsistent with the surrounding development. Mr. McCaffrey said he did not think the project was consistent with the surrounding development, and that this should be a project detriment. Mr. Idman suggested the phrasing that the design is inconsistent with local development patterns in the area could be removed. Ms. Flynn moved to adopt the detriment with the change suggested by Mr. Idman. Mr. McCormack seconded the motion, noting that the project will need a special permit for lot coverage according to a letter received from the town planner.

Mr. Virgilio restated that he thinks the detriment is too closely related to the HPCC MPS of the RPP. Mr. Idman said the Subcommittee could choose to not adopt this detriment. Mr. Harris said there was not substantial evidence in the record to make such a finding. Mr. McCormack said the zoning allows 35' tall buildings. Mr. McCaffrey said the zoning only allows 20% structural lot coverage.

Mr. Idman reiterated Mr. Harris' and Mr. McCormack's comments that benefits and detriments should be substantiated and should focus on regional issues, not local issues that will be decided directly by local boards under their standards of review. Mr. McCaffrey said the building is large. Mr. Harris said that information must be submitted to substantiate large size as a detriment. Mr. McCaffrey said there had been a significant amount of testimony. Mr. Harris said the Subcommittee cannot make decisions based solely on public testimony. Mr. McCaffrey said that comment from the public should be considered. Ms. Flynn read from a letter from the public that the project is not consistent with the MPS of the RPP.

Mr. Idman said that the Subcommittee must decide if the project is a large-sized building and then determine if the size of the building is a detriment. Mr. Virgilio said the project is consistent with the MPS. Mr. Idman said the Subcommittee does not need to include the detriment if it chooses not to. Mr. McCormack noted that he had seconded the motion.

Ms. Flynn said the project would encompass the entire street frontage. She said she did not think some the trees shown on renderings of the building would be planted. Mr. Ribeiro clarified that those trees were shown were on the planting plan and would therefore be required to be planted in any DRI decision approving the project. Ms. Flynn said the new trees would not be as large as the mature trees present currently.

Mr. Niedzwiecki said a lot of comments about the size and coverage of the building, and the Subcommittee might find that those issues are better handled locally. He said if the impact of the building would detrimentally affect the character of the area viewed from regional roadway, the Subcommittee could find the detriment. Mr. McCaffrey said the size of the building would detrimentally affect the village center. Mr. Virgilio said he thought these concerns would be best handled at the local level.

Mr. Niedzwiecki said the memorandum characterized testimony from the public to establish suggested detriments. Mr. McCaffrey asked if the detriment could be the concern itself of the

community. Ms. Flynn said the building is out of scale with the neighborhood and is inconsistent with the RPP. Mr. Ribeiro noted that the Subcommittee had already found the project was consistent with the MPS of the RPP.

Ms. Flynn said the size of the building was a legitimate detriment, and moved to adopt it. Mr. Roy seconded. Mr. Niedzwiecki said the Subcommittee should determine if the comment from the public is local or regional in nature. Ms. Flynn said the language reflects the thoughts of the public. Mr. Harris said the issue is local. Mr. McCormack said the RPP findings covered the issue. Mr. Idman said the proposed detriment deals with size not design. Mr. Virgilio called for a vote. Mr. Roy, Ms. Flynn, and Mr. Harris voted in favor of adopting the detriment. Mr. Virgilio and Mr. McCormack were opposed.

Mr. Virgilio read the second detriment, that the project would be insensitive to abutting properties by being insufficiently screened and buffered. He said he thought the issue was covered with the vote on RPP consistency.

Ms. Flynn said the detriment should be adopted without the note listed with the detriment in the memorandum. Mr. Idman said the detriment should be construed to relate to neighboring commercial properties. Ms. Flynn moved to adopt the detriment as written without the accompanying note.

Mr. Wielgus said the term insensitive was inherently subjective. She suggest the detriment be worded instead as the building would not be fully screened and buffered from neighboring properties. Ms. Flynn withdrew her motion and moved to adopt Ms. Wielgus' language as a detriment. Mr. Harris seconded and all were in favor.

Mr. Virgilio read the third detriment, that the project is inappropriately sited on this portion of Main Street. Mr. McCormack said the use is allowed by special permit under the local zoning. Ms. Flynn said the previous detriments were more relevant. Mr. Roy said the proposed detriment goes to the use of the building. He noted there is a hotel across the street. Mr. Roy moved the detriment not be adopted. Mr. Virgilio seconded. Mr. Roy, Mr. Virgilio, Mr. McCormack, and Ms. Flynn were in favor. Mr. Harris abstained.

Mr. Virgilio read the fourth detriment, that the project is not consistent with intent of the Business Redevelopment zoning. Mr. McCormack said the intent was to foster housing and retail, but Commission staff should verify the purpose. Mr. Ribeiro read the statement of purpose from the zoning bylaw. Mr. Roy moved to adopt the detriment with the added phrase "to provide for mixed-use redevelopment," and Ms. Flynn seconded. All were in favor.

Mr. Virgilio read the fifth detriment, that the project would negatively affect locally owned commercial accommodations businesses. Ms. Wielgus suggested the detriment be changed that the project possibly would take business from locally owned commercial accommodations. Mr. McCormack said it would possibly take business, but not probably. Mr. McCaffrey said the detriment sounds like normal competition. Ms. Flynn said the marketplace should decide. Mr. McCormack moved not to adopt the detriment, and Mr. Virgilio seconded. All were in favor.

Mr. Virgilio read the sixth detriment, that the project would not effectively engage the public along Main Street. Mr. Idman said the detriment was especially in reference to the area of the west building where the green screen is proposed. Mr. McCaffrey said the design does not engage the public enough despite the applicant's design changes that added an entrance to the eastern building on Main Street. Mr. Roy said the change that created a front entrance to the eastern building was significant. Mr. McCaffrey asked if the public could use the front patio. Mr. Idman replied it would be no more public or private than any other business space along Main Street. Mr. Roy moved not to adopt the detriment, and Mr. Virgilio seconded. Mr. Roy, Mr. Virgilio, Mr. Harris, and Mr. McCormack were in favor. Ms. Flynn was opposed.

Mr. Virgilio read the seventh detriment, that the project would negatively affect the flow of traffic along Main Street compared with current conditions. Mr. Idman said the detriment was included because of comment from the public, but Commission staff feels strongly that it should not be included. He introduced Steven Tupper, Technical Services Planner. Mr. Tupper said the increase in traffic, as based on use, would not be a significant increase. Mr. Tupper said hotel uses are low traffic generators, similar to an office use. He said the location on Main Street allows for non-motorized trips, which reduces vehicle trips. He said Main Street is a low speed road, and the roadway can accommodate additional trips. He said if this detriment is adopted, the implication is that any additional trip generation should be included as a project detriment in all projects. He said this would negatively affect many other projects in the future, especially those proposing to rehabilitate blighted sites.

Ms. Flynn said she is worried that cars unloading to the lobby will back up onto Main Street. Mr. Virgilio said the slow traffic zone does help with safety and calms traffic. Mr. Harris asked Mr. Tupper if he looked at the comments from the public. Mr. Tupper said they did review the comments but the analysis was done using technical data. He said some of the other traffic concerns, such as site circulation, might be and is more properly reviewed at the local level, and that the RPP does not contain site circulations MPSs. Mr. McCaffrey asked if it was correct that though there is significant traffic on Main Street, the proposed hotel would be a marginal increase. Mr. Tupper said he was correct.

Ms. Flynn said she is worried about site circulation. Mr. Idman said that would be part of local site plan review. Ms. Flynn said she is also concerned about off-site parking. Mr. McCaffrey suggested adopting the language that the project would negatively affect the flow of traffic on Main Street.

Mr. Niedzwiecki said traffic on Main Street might not necessarily be a detriment. He noted that slow traffic zones have a traffic calming effect. He said congestion means a lot of customers for local businesses. Ms. Flynn agreed that the congestion on Main Street is good for the community and local businesses.

Mr. Virgilio moved not to adopt the detriment, and Mr. McCormack seconded. Ms. Flynn suggested the wording be changed to delete the word negatively. Mr. Idman reminded the Subcommittee of the potential repercussions as stated by Mr. Tupper. Mr. McCormack noted that any redevelopment would create additional trips at this location. Mr. Virgilio called for a

vote. Mr. Virgilio, Mr. McCormack, Mr. Roy, and Mr. Harris were in favor. Ms. Flynn was opposed.

Mr. Virgilio read the eighth detriment, that the project would not pay workers a living wage as based on employment data from the application materials. Mr. McCormack suggested the wording be changed to some workers. Mr. Roy asked if the workers would be making less than workers at hotels elsewhere in town. Mr. McCaffrey said it is not a detriment to this hotel but to hotels in general. He said alternative uses on this site might also pay lower wages. Mr. McCormack moved not to adopt the detriment, and Mr. Roy seconded. Mr. Virgilio, Mr. McCormack, Mr. Roy, and Mr. Harris were in favor. Ms. Flynn was opposed.

Mr. Idman asked if there were any other detriments to be suggested by the Subcommittee. Mr. Virgilio asked if the Subcommittee should hold another meeting. Mr. Niedzwiecki said staff needed direction on how to draft a decision before the close of the hearing period.

Ms. Flynn suggested the removal of mature trees from the site as a detriment. Mr. Roy asked Mr. Walker for clarification as to what plans would remain. Mr. Walker said the trees to remain are marked on the project plans.

Mr. Niedzwiecki said staff could work with Ms. Flynn to identify those concerns, and any additional detriments could be proposed at the full Commission. He said the Subcommittee should weigh the benefits and detriments.

Mr. McCaffrey said the project is too large for the site, and the resulting impact on character is a detriment that outweighs all the benefits. Mr. McCormack moved that the probable project benefit is greater than the probable project detriment. Mr. Virgilio seconded. Mr. McCormack said from his observation, the benefits clearly outweigh the detriments. Ms. Flynn said the benefits of the project are not compelling when compared with the detriment of the impact on the character of Main Street. Mr. McCormack said many of the issues should be handled at the full Commission and review at the local level.

Ms. Flynn said the Subcommittee should remember the Commission has greater power than many local boards. Mr. Virgilio said the Subcommittee should consider the experience from past projects when making this decision. Mr. Virgilio, Mr. Roy, and Mr. McCormack voted in favor of the motion. Ms. Flynn was against. Mr. Harris abstained.

Mr. McCormack moved to instruct staff to prepare a draft decision consistent with the Subcommittee's findings, and Mr. Roy seconded. Mr. Virgilio, Mr. McCormack, Mr. Roy, and Ms. Flynn were in favor. Mr. Harris abstained.

Mr. Virgilio moved to adjourn, and Mr. McCormack seconded. All were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 5:24pm.

Springhill Suites by Marriott (TR14017) July 30, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Respectfully submitted,



Ernest Virgilio, Chair, Springhill Suites by Marriott Subcommittee

8/20/15

Date