



Town of Hopkinton

330 Main Street • Hopkinton, New Hampshire 03229 • www.hopkinton-nh.gov

Tel: 603-746-3170

Fax: 603-746-3049

HOPKINTON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

MINUTES

JANUARY 3, 2019

Members present: Chairman Daniel Rinden, Toni Gray, Charles Koontz, Jessica Scheinman, and Alternate Jonathan Eck. Staff present: Planning Director Karen Robertson.

I. **Call to Order.** Chairman Rinden called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM in the Hopkinton Town Hall.

II. **Applications.**

#2019-02 James Matte Attorney Maria Dolder of Hebert & Dolder, on behalf of the Applicant, addressed the Board to request a Variance to convert the building at 2201 Hopkinton Road into a seven (7) unit residential multi-family dwelling. The property is owned by Alexander Klan and Jeannette Brown, and is in the R-3 district, shown on Tax Map 240 as Lot 3. The application was submitted per Zoning Ordinance Table of Uses 3.6.A.3.

Attorney Dolder began by explaining the history of the residence which was originally constructed in the late 1700's, and has had many uses, including being used as a stagecoach stop in the 1800's. Between 1915-1970, the building was used as an inn and was described in advertisements as a place with up to fifty (50) guests. Currently, the building was re-designed when it was converted to an inn, so that it could accommodate a dining area, ballroom, tennis courts, etc. The building consists of four floors of approximately 5,000 SF and has an attached barn. The barn area has a kitchen prep area that was once used for the inn. Most recently, the building was used for a home business.

The Applicant proposes to rehabilitate and convert the building into seven (7) multi-residential units, two (2) bedrooms each, in the R-3 district. In addition, the Applicant proposes to reconstruct a porch by Special Exception. There will be eleven (11) parking spaces; while, the Zoning Ordinance requires ten (10) spaces. The driveway has 400-feet of site distance in both directions. The property is served by a private well and septic system. The septic system may need further approval for the use.

The Applicant's response to the criteria for a Variance as outlined in Section XV of the Zoning Ordinance was as follows:

- 1) **The proposed use would not diminish the surrounding property values because:** "The existing building itself is in a state of disrepair and needs a large amount of work. The rehabilitation of the property will be a significant improvement to the values in the vicinity. The building itself already exists on the property and, with the exception of the proposed porch, the Applicant is not proposing any exterior changes to the building. Since there is no change to its size or location, the proposal does not have any adverse

Adopted: 02/05/2019

impact to the neighborhood, but shall instead be a benefit to the area. The use will remain residential and the use will be contained on site.”

2) Granting the Variance would not be contrary to the public interest because: “To be contrary to the public interest, the variance must unduly, and in a marked degree conflict with the ordinance such that it violates the ordinance’s basic zoning objectives. To ascertain whether granting the variance would violate basic zoning objectives you must examine whether it would alter the essential characteristics of the neighborhood or would threaten the public health, safety or welfare of the public. The Applicant’s requested variance does neither. The building itself already exists on the property and, with the exception of the proposed porch, the Applicant is not proposing any exterior changes to the building. But for the residential structure across the street, the location of the residential building is relatively secluded. The building sits on a wooded lot which provides a dense natural buffer from abutting properties, even in the winter time. Similarly, the use of the property will remain residential. The Applicant is proposing to rehabilitate the property and bring it into closer conformity to its original stature. The main building has four floors of living area and contains over 5,000 square feet, with another three stories in the barn. As such, the property can support the proposed use. To further demonstrate this, the Applicant is able to provide the required parking for the proposed use on site. The property is located on a main road, with the existing driveway location providing the required 400 foot all season safe site distance in both directions. Accordingly, the granting of the relief requested herein shall have no impact on public safety, health or general welfare of the public and will not be contrary to public interest. Instead, granting the variance will allow the Applicant to utilize this property in a reasonable manner.”

3) By granting the Variance substantial justice would be done because: “One of the guiding rules in evaluating substantial justice is that any loss to the individual that is not outweighed by a gain to the general public is an injustice. Under this standard, the Applicant clearly satisfies this required. As stated above, the building itself already exists on the property and, with the exception of the proposed porch, the Applicant is not proposing any exterior changes to the building. The use will remain residential and will not have any adverse impact on the neighborhood. Given the size of the structure, along with the fact that it was historically used and designed as an inn, it is not reasonable to expect that the property can be utilized as a single-family residence. The property, as designed and in its current state, has twelve (12) bedrooms. Clearly, this is not a typical layout for a single-family residence. Furthermore, the existing building itself is in a state of disrepair and needs a significant amount of work. It is not reasonable to expect that purchasers of a single-family home will have the resources to perform the extensive renovations required. By granting the variance, substantial justice will be done since a denial would be a tremendous loss to the Applicant without any justified gain to the public.

Substantial justice is also achieved by granting variances which do not adversely impact on nearby property owners and which allow a property to be used reasonably. As stated above, even with the requested relief, the difference between that required under the Ordinance and that being proposed shall not create any adverse effect on the adjoining neighborhood. The building sits on a wooded lot which provides a dense natural buffer from abutting properties, even in the winter time. Given this and the fact that the use of the property will remain residential, the proposed use will not adversely impact on nearby

property owners, but alternatively, will allow the property to be used reasonably, therefore resulting in substantial justice.”

- 4) The spirit and intent of the Ordinance will not be broken by granting the Variance because:** “One of the stated purposes of the R-3 district is to allow for uses that can be accommodated on the land without major disruptions of the natural terrain and vegetation. Given that the building itself is pre-existing, there is no conflict with such an intent. Similarly, the Applicant is making a concerted effort to design the on-site parking in a manner that complies with the Zoning Ordinance but maintains the natural terrain and causes minimal disruption to the vegetation. As previously stated, the location of the residential building is relatively secluded due to the fact that it sits on a wooded lot which provides a dense natural buffer from abutting properties, even in the winter time. Additionally, the Applicant is proposing a maximum of seven (7) units, which complies with the multi-family requirements in the Zoning Ordinance. One of the general purposes of the Zoning Ordinance is to encourage the most appropriate use of land throughout the Town. In this particular case, granting the variance would be consistent with such a purpose.”
- 5) Literal enforcement of the Ordinance results in unnecessary hardship.**
- (a) For purposes of this subparagraph, “unnecessary hardship” means that, owning to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area.**
- (i) No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property.** “This property is certainly unique in several ways. First of all, it is amongst one of the oldest structures in the Town and has served many purposes over the years. One of the most unique aspects of the property is its previous use and design as an inn, known as the Mount Lookout House. As previously stated, the barn area still contains what appears to be a kitchen preparation area used in connection with the inn. Along with that, the property, as designed and in its current state, has twelve (12) bedrooms spanned over four (4) floors in the main building, with another three (3) stories in the barn. This is not a typical layout for a single-family residence and such a use of the property is not reasonable. Furthermore, the existing building and barn are in a state of disrepair and need a significant amount of work. It is not reasonable to expect that purchasers of a single-family home will have the resources to perform the extensive renovations that are required. On the other hand, the proposed use will allow the property to be updated, making it more aesthetic in appearance and compatible with surrounding uses, while providing reasonable housing opportunities in the Town. The relief being requested by the Applicant is the minimum relief required in order to allow the Applicant to reasonably re-develop the site. It is also important to once again note that the location of the residential building is relatively secluded due to the fact that it sits on a wooded lot which provides a dense natural buffer from abutting properties. Even with the proposal, the Applicant is able to maintain a large buffer. Given that the proposed use will not alter the essential characteristics of the neighborhood or the property, but instead will allow the property to be used for and in the same spirit as designed,

there is no fair and substantial relationship between the general purposes of the Zoning Ordinance and the specific restrictions on the property.”

(ii) The proposed use is a reasonable use. “As stated above, the use of the property, even as proposed, will remain residential. It will continue to maintain a natural buffer from abutting properties. The variance relief will simply allow the Applicant to rehabilitate the property and use it in the most appropriate manner for the existing building. Given its location in the R-3 district, the proposed use cannot be established without the requested variance.”

(b) If the criteria in subparagraph (a) are not established, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it. “As stated above, this property is unique in several ways. First of all, it is amongst one of the oldest structures in the Town and has served many purposes over the years. One of the most unique aspects of the property is its previous use and design as an inn, known as the Mount Lookout House. In fact, the barn area still contains what appears to be a kitchen preparation area used in connection with the inn. Along with that, the property, as designed and in its current state, has twelve (12) bedrooms spanned over four (4) floors in the main building, with another three (3) stories in the barn. This is not a typical layout of a single-family residence and such a use of the property is not reasonable. Furthermore, the existing building and barn are in a state of disrepair and need a significant amount of work. It is not reasonable to expect that purchasers of a single-family home will have the resources to perform the extensive renovations that area required. On the other hand, the proposed use will allow the property to be upgraded, making it more aesthetic in appearance and compatible with surrounding uses, while providing reasonable housing opportunities in the Town. In this case, a multi-family residence is the most appropriate use of the land and the only way to achieve such a reasonable use, is with the requested variance.”

Mrs. Gray questioned whether the barn will be used for residential units. Attorney Dolder responded that they expect three (3) units in the barn but are reviewing the changes that will be required in order to utilize the space. The actual configuration of the units has not been finalized. She noted that the main building will include an elevator to get to the upper floors.

Ms. Scheinman inquired about the recent history and ownership of the property. Attorney Dolder noted that based on discussions with the broker, the current owners purchased the property with the intentions of rehabilitating the home. It appears that the project was much larger than they had anticipated, as they are currently living on the first floor. Attorney Dolder believes that the current owners had once used the barn for a home business.

Mr. Eck suggested, based on the presentation, that since the 1970's, at least 40 plus years, the property has been used as a single-family residential property. Attorney Dolder agreed, stating that it has been used as a residential property in various forms.

Ms. Scheinman stated that the property sits along a busy road and along a curve. She questioned whether there are plans to change the driveway because it is currently going in an

uphill direction. Attorney Dolder was unsure if the driveway could be sloped differently. She noted that the driveway in its present location meets the sight distance requirements.

Mr. Eck asked Attorney Dolder about the number of multi-family units in the R-3 district, and the number of two-family units that have been approved in the district, and whether there are any multi-family units within close proximity to the property in question. Attorney Dolder stated that she did not know because they had only looked at the abutting properties. She noted that the area is sparse and wooded. There is a house across the street and a house behind and to the side of the property in question.

Mr. Eck asked Attorney Dolder to further explain how the proposed use is not totally contrary to the zoning or the character of the area and the R-3 district. Attorney Dolder responded that the property is already established. The building was designed and built as an inn. She noted that the R-3 district clearly came after the fact, and that they understand that the proposal is contrary, not permitted in the district. The location makes the property unique.

Mr. Eck stated that the request is to utilize the property in a fashion that is different from what it has been used for over the past 45 years. Attorney Dolder responded that the owner has struggled to use the property in that manner. They have only used the first floor. The property is in disrepair.

Mr. Eck questioned the zoning standard that allows the Board to consider whether the property is being utilized to its fullest extent. Attorney Dolder acknowledged that using a property to the fullest extent is not a standard; however, she believed that a variance only requires that the use be reasonable.

Mr. Koontz suggested that seven (7) units is a lot. Attorney Dolder stated that while they have requested seven (7) units, they would be interested in the Board's feedback as to the appropriate number of units. If, the Board suggests that seven (7) units is too much, the Applicant would like an opportunity to table and amend the application, in order to consider a lesser number. She noted that her client would need to consider the number of units that would be cost effective in order to go forward with the project. Mr. Koontz suggested that the number of units be sustainable and reasonable.

Chairman Rinden inquired as to whether the units will be apartments or condominiums. Attorney Dolder stated that the units will remain apartments, owned by her client.

Mrs. Gray inquired about access to the units on the upper floors and whether the Fire Department had an opportunity to review the proposal. Attorney Dolder stated that they will install an elevator to access the upper floors. Mrs. Robertson noted that the Applicant has discussed the proposal with the Fire Department.

Mr. Eck questioned whether there are historical limitations as to what can be done in terms of renovations or razing the building. Attorney Dolder was not aware of any limitations with the use or renovations. She suggested that if the building were razed it could not be rebuilt in its present location as it sits within the setbacks. Mr. Eck noted that a new single-family residence could be constructed. Attorney Dolder agreed, noting that the building would need to comply with current zoning.

Mrs. Scheinman noted that the Ordinance permits, by special exception, the building to be used as a bed and breakfast inn. Attorney Dolder agreed, stating that a maximum of seven (7) rooms could be used for a bed and breakfast inn. She suggested that using the building as a bed and breakfast inn would be a more intense use with people, regularly, going to and from the property.

Mr. Koontz questioned the difference between seven (7) residential units and seven (7) bed and breakfast rooms. Attorney Dolder stated that there is no difference; other than breakfast being served on a regular basis. She noted that the same people would be residing at the multi-family building; while, there would be a constant change in occupancy for a bed and breakfast inn.

Mrs. Scheinman asked Attorney Dolder about the number of units, if less than seven (7), that her client would need to move forward with the proposal. Attorney Dolder responded by saying that her client would need time to review the costs. She suggested that if the Board were to indicate that six (6) units would be appropriate her client would most likely agree to six (6) units.

Mr. Eck suggested that if there were seven (7), two (2) bedroom units, there is a potential for seven (7) families of four (4) living at the property. A possibility of a minimum of seven (7) people to a potential of twenty-eight (28) people with parking proposed for eleven (11) vehicles. Attorney Dolder acknowledged the potential for a various number of residents; however, she stated that the same number of people could be at a bed and breakfast inn. She then noted that the number of parking spaces is required by zoning.

Chairman Rinden opened public testimony.

Abutter David Jensen, 16 Gould Hill Road, spoke in opposition to the proposal. Mr. Jensen stated that he had been advised by real estate broker, Judy Hampe, that when you introduce multi-family dwellings in a single-family district it has a negative effect on the single-family dwellings. Mr. Jensen suggested that having a seven (7) family dwelling will have a negative effect on properties up and down Hopkinton Road and along Gould Hill Road and Putney Hill Road.

Abutter George Schell, 2208 Hopkinton Road, spoke in opposition to the proposal. Mr. Schell has lived across the street from the property for the past 21 years. Mr. Schell suggested that the exterior of the building needs improvements, but that the Applicant had not indicated that he has plans to do so. He expressed concern with the effects on property values in the vicinity as there has been no documentation supporting the Applicant's statement that the proposal will improve property values. Mr. Schell further expressed concern with the additional residents and vehicles along that section of Hopkinton Road. He suggested that the location, along a hill and curve, is hazardous. Mr. Schell then questioned the effects that the proposal will have on the water table and sewage disposal.

Lastly, Mr. Schell informed the Board of a second individual that is interested in buying the property for use as a single-family residence. The gentleman had reached out to Mr. Schell earlier in the day and provided him with a letter in opposition to the proposal that Mr. Schell was willing to submit to the Board. In response, Mrs. Robertson said the individual is a non-

resident that had spoken to her about using the property for boarding or renting rooms. Mrs. Robertson noted that since their discussion the gentleman may have changed his plans.

Mr. Koontz asked Mr. Schell whether he believes the values in the area would increase or decrease if the property remained in its present condition. In response, Mr. Schell stated that the multi-family use would further decrease values.

Abutter Mike Martin, 2241 Hopkinton Road, spoke in opposition to the proposal. Mr. Martin explained the process he had gone through in deciding to construct a new home while taking into consideration the potential uses of the properties in the area. At the time, Mr. Martin had reviewed the Zoning Ordinance and found that single-family residences were permitted, two-family residences required a special exception, and multi-family units were not permitted. He was aware that a bed and breakfast inn would require a special exception, but considered the possibility that the owner would reside at the property. At the time, he believed that having a bed and breakfast inn on the abutting property would be a better use than an apartment building.

Lastly, Mr. Martin referred to various provisions of the Zoning Ordinance including requiring separate entrances for multi-family units, prohibiting a non-conforming lot from being further reduced and prohibiting a non-conforming use from being re-established.

Abutter Dorothy Martin, 2241 Hopkinton Road, spoke in agreement with those that had already spoken in opposition to the proposal. Mrs. Martin explained her experiences when trying to enter and exit her property, which is located on the same hill and curve, adjacent to the property in question.

The agent (George Carroll) for the Applicant, who is a Hopkinton resident, spoke in favor of the proposal. The gentleman once lived at the property. He explained that the upper two (2) levels of the home are not functional, as there is no heat or plumbing. He believes that converting the home to multi-residential units would provide needed housing in Hopkinton.

In rebuttal, Attorney Dolder clarified that there are plans to refurbish the outside and interior of the building. Attorney Dolder's original testimony concerning changes to the exterior of the property was referencing that there is no plan to enlarge the building.

In response to Mr. Martin's reference to the non-conforming provisions of the Ordinance that outline conditions to change from one non-conforming use to another, Attorney Dolder pointed out that the non-conforming provisions of the Ordinance are not applicable as the present use of the property is a conforming use.

Attorney Dolder reiterated that the number of parking spaces is determined by the Zoning Ordinance and that her client is willing to discuss the parking with the Planning Board and make modifications, if necessary. With respect to concerns with water and sewage, Attorney Dolder noted that the issue will be addressed as part of Site Plan Review. If it is necessary, a new septic system will be designed and approved by the State.

Lastly, Attorney Dolder stated that her client had been informed by the seller's agent that there is no other offer on the property.

Ms. Scheinman inquired about the time-frame the property has been for sale. Attorney Dolder stated that the listing had shown that it was on the market for 225 days. The Applicant's agent noted that the property has been on and off the market, and it is for sale now at a reduced price.

In rebuttal, Mr. Martin believed that the property was once a non-conforming use and once it was converted to a single-family residence it became conforming. It is Mr. Martin's understanding that the use of the property cannot revert back to a non-conforming use.

Mr. Martin spoke of his concern with the height of the building and its effects on life safety, if emergency services are needed to evacuate the building.

Mr. Koontz asked a procedural question involving the process by which the Applicant can withdraw the application, if they choose to do so. He questioned whether withdrawal would be necessary before public testimony is closed. In response, Mr. Eck was opposed to a withdrawal as the Board has reviewed the application for the past hour, which included public testimony.

At this time, Chairman Rinden declared public testimony closed, and Board members began deliberations.

Briefly, Board members reviewed the provisions in the Ordinance that show that up to seven (7) rooms can be used for a bed and breakfast inn.

Attorney Dolder asked the Board to table the application, so that her client has an opportunity to reconsider the number of units. In response, Mr. Eck asked for the authority that allows an applicant to table an application after which the Board has spent over an hour reviewing the application and hearing public testimony. Attorney Dolder believed that an applicant can ask that an application be tabled at any point during a meeting. Furthermore, she suggested that it is common zoning law that gives the authority to do so.

Ms. Robertson said that it has been her experience that an applicant can ask that their application be tabled; however, the Board must decide whether or not to grant the request.

Ms. Scheinman asked if the only reason for tabling the application is to gather more information concerning the number of units. Attorney Dolder replied yes and suggested that the feedback from the Board is that there is a concern with the number of units. Rather than denying the application, due to the number of units proposed, Attorney Dolder suggested that the Board table the application, so that the Applicant can consider whether the project will work with a lesser number of units. In response, Mr. Eck stated that the number of units is not the only issue of concern. All members agreed.

Mrs. Gray expressed concern with the effects on surrounding property values. Mr. Koontz expressed concern that the potential number of residents and traffic will have on the character of the neighborhood, noting that seven (7) units is a substantial change. He suggested that an evaluation of the proposal by a real estate broker would be helpful. Mr. Eck said that his opinion or concerns would be the same whether the project includes three (3) or seven (7) units. Ms. Scheinman expressed concerns with the number of units but noted that the number of units was not her only concern. She was not convinced that

granting the Variance would be in the public's interest.

With five members voting, all five members (Eck, Gray, Koontz, Scheinman, and Rinden) were not in favor of continuing the application.

In considering whether the Applicant successfully addressed all criteria to be granted a Variance, the Board reviewed each criterion.

- 1) Granting the Variance (would – would not) be contrary to the public interest.

In response to item 1 of the criteria, Chairman Rinden expressed concern with the added traffic safety hazard along the curve and hill. Mrs. Gray concurred.

Mr. Eck admired the Applicant's desire to improve the property but believed that the proposal is contrary to the character of the area and vastly different from similar applications that the Board had reviewed for multi-family dwellings. Furthermore, the expansion will drastically change the R-3 district and neighborhood, noting that the Applicant was not able to identify other multi-family dwellings in the district or vicinity. Furthermore, multi-family units would be contrary to the public interest because it would be a departure from the R-3 district.

- 2) The spirit of the Ordinance (would – would not) be broken.

Ms. Scheinman stated that the R-3 district is a low-density district. The proposed increase in density (multi-family units) is not consistent with the spirit of the Ordinance with respect to the zoning district. The concerns of the abutters, including the one abutter that had reviewed the Ordinance before buying his property and had expectations as to the zoning for the area, is a consideration. Ms. Scheinman believed that the spirit of the Ordinance would be broken by granting the Variance.

Mr. Eck believed that the R-3 district was not intended to accommodate twenty (20) plus people in an apartment like setting on a permanent basis.

- 3) Granting the Variance (would – would not) do substantial justice.

Ms. Scheinman recognized that there are issues with the property, but noted that the property has been used as a single-family residence for forty (40) plus years. She does not believe that granting the Variance would do substantial justice to the abutters of the district.

- 4) The values of the surrounding properties (would – would not) be diminished.

Based on testimony of the abutters, Mrs. Gray believed that the property values in the vicinity would diminish if there were a multi-family dwelling. Chairman Rinden agreed.

- 5) Unnecessary Hardship.

Again, Mr. Eck suggested that the R-3 district had been designed for less density than what is being proposed by the Applicant. He believed that there is a fair and substantial

relationship to the public purpose behind the Ordinance provision and its application to the property. Ms. Scheinman agreed, noting that the size of the property does not justify granting an exception to the Zoning Ordinance.

Members expressed concerns with the additional traffic and traffic safety, and the increased potential density of the number of residents and associated vehicles at the property.

Chairman Rinden reiterated the fact that the property can and is being used as a single-family residence. Furthermore, the current owners had once operated a home business from the property. Mrs. Gray concurred, stating that the location is appropriate for the continued use as a single-family dwelling. Mr. Eck also agreed, stating that history has shown that the property can and has been used in strict conformance with the Zoning Ordinance.

Toni Gray, seconded by Jessica Scheinman, moved to **DENY** Application #2019-2 as presented. Motion carried in the affirmative (Eck, Gray, Koontz, Scheinman, and Rinden). The Applicant did not successfully address all criteria to be granted a Variance as outlined in Section XV of the Zoning Ordinance.

Reasons for Denial as follows:

- The proposal is contrary to the character and nature of the neighborhood, which consists of single-family dwellings.
- The proposal is a departure from the zoning in the R-3 (low density) district, which allows single-family and two-family dwellings and prohibits multi-family dwellings.
- The proposed intensity of the use is not consistent with the spirit and intent of the Zoning Ordinance and the R-3 (low density) district, which is to provide low density residential development. Whereas, the proposal has the potential for 20 plus people residing in an apartment like setting.
- Requiring the property to be utilized in accordance with the provisions of the district, low density residential, is necessary in order to give full effect to the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance for the respective district.
- Literal enforcement of the Ordinance will not result in an unnecessary hardship as the property has been used for a permitted use, a single-family residence, for the past 40 or more years.
- The size of the residence is not a factor that justifies an exception to the Zoning Ordinance for the R-3 (low density) district.
- The potential traffic and the location of the property, on a hill and along a curve, will cause a traffic safety hazard.

#2019-03 James Matte Special Exception to construct a porch onto an existing, non-conforming residential structure where the setback of the addition will be no less than the setback of the existing structure. The property is located at 2201 Hopkinton Road, owned by Alexander Klan and Jeannette Brown, and is in the R-3 district, shown on Tax Map 240 as Lot 3. The application was submitted per Zoning Ordinance Section 4.4.8.

The application was not reviewed as the earlier application (#2019-02) for a Variance was denied.

II. Review of Minutes and Notices of Decisions.

Toni Gray, seconded by Charles Koontz, moved to **APPROVE** the Minutes of November 27, 2018, with typographical corrections. With five members voting, four voted in favor (Eck, Gray, Koontz, and Rinden) and one voted in abstention (Scheinman).

Toni Gray, seconded by Charles Koontz, moved to **APPROVE** the Notice of Decision of November 27, 2018, as presented. With five members voting, four voted in favor (Eck, Gray, Koontz, and Rinden) and one voted in abstention (Scheinman).

III. Adjournment.

Charles Koontz, seconded by Toni Gray, moved to **ADJOURN** the meeting at 7:25 PM. Motion carried unanimously in the affirmative. The next regular scheduled meeting of the Hopkinton Zoning Board of Adjustment is at 5:30 PM on Tuesday, February 5, 2019, at the Hopkinton Town Hall.

Karen Robertson
Planning Director

Ordinance §15.10. "Representations made at the public hearing or material submitted to the Board by an applicant for a special exception or variance concerning features of proposed buildings, structures, parking, or uses which are subject to regulations pursuant to subsection 15.8.2 or 15.8.3 shall be deemed conditions upon such special exception or variance."