

RECEIVED
ENFIELD TOWN CLERK

Unapproved Minutes
BAA Hearings Meeting
April 16, 2026 1:00pm

2026 APR 20 PM 4: 22

Sheila M Bailey

Roll Call: Lori Longhi, Dan DeGray

Vice Chairman Andrew Urbanowicz entered at 1:50pm

Hearings for Assessment Appeals, deliberations and or decisions. See attachment for appeal number and names.

Motion was made by the Vice Chairman Urbanowicz and seconded by Secretary Dan DeGray to adjourn the Meeting at 5:00pm motion unanimously passed.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel DeGray

BAA Recording Secretary

SIGN-IN SHEET

BAA - 2025 GRAND LIST

APRIL 16, 2026

APPEAL NUMBER	NAME	TIME
23	Timothy M. Herbst	1:10 PM
24	Cathy Salemi	1:20 pm
14	Bob Atzoll	1:50
37	The Grove	1:56
7	Zachary Puffer	2:17 PM
2	VASILIOS KARASINIS	2:30 PM
42 ⁹	William Moran	3:00
20	Gaetano Marino	2:40 PM
41	Donald Longo D/B/A Field St/Arco	2:50 PM
8	Laura + Keith Peterson	3 ¹⁰
10	Al + Donna Doyker	3 ²⁰
6	Mrs M. Berry	3:50

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 2

Decision Date: 9/16/26

Property Owner/Agent: Vasileios Karabinidis MD

Property Type & Location: Personal Property, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Office closed in August 2025. Paid final tax bill claiming he filed business closure form. AW personal property disposed of.

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

☒ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal
OR

☐ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED / DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous	
Daniel DeGray	☒ Yay ☐ Nay
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	<u>43740</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-43740</u>
Totals	<u>43740</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-43740</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 3

Decision Date: 4/16/2026

Property Owner/Agent: Scott DeLorge

Property Type & Location: Personal Property, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: States he pressed send but it did not go through. Repeat of failing to file on time, purpose to bring people in compliance can reduce penalty however failing to file repeatedly.

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

 HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal
OR

✓ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED / DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous	<u>✓</u>
Daniel DeGray	<u> </u> Yay <u> </u> Nay
Lori Longhi	<u> </u> Yay <u> </u> Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	<u> </u> Yay <u> </u> Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>3660</u>	<u>3660</u>	<u>- 0 -</u>
Totals	<u>3660</u>	<u>3660</u>	<u>- 0 -</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 4
Decision Date: 4/16/26

Property Owner/Agent: Scott DeLorge
Property Type & Location: Personal Property, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Claims he filed but the town has no record of filing. Provided a copy of what was filed. Dated it day of hearing, Repeat of fail to file on time more than one year.
After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

 HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal
OR
✓ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous	<u>✓</u>
Daniel DeGray	<u> </u> Yay <u> </u> Nay
Lori Longhi	<u> </u> Yay <u> </u> Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	<u> </u> Yay <u> </u> Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>13,750</u>	<u>13,750</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>13,750</u>	<u>13,750</u>	<u>0</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 5
Decision Date: 4/13/26

Property Owner/Agent: Scott DeLorge

Property Type & Location: 336 G. Washington Rd., Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Claimed Various Issues with Field Card. The valuation set previously by BAA is still in place.

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

☐ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal
OR
☒ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous	
Daniel DeGray	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>56,591</u>	<u>56,591</u>	<u>0</u>
Building	<u>262,000</u>	<u>262,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Out Buildings	<u>53,200</u>	<u>53,200</u>	<u>0</u>
Personal Property	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
Totals	<u>371,500</u>	<u>371,500</u>	<u>0</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 6

Decision Date: 4/16/2026

Property Owner/Agent: Frances Berry

Property Type & Location: Personal Property, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Property is not functional equipment. It is a piece of art.
Business closed over 10 years ago.

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

☒ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal
OR

☐ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED / DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous	☒
Daniel DeGray	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	<u>1190</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-1190</u>
Totals	<u>1190</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-1190</u>

terminated
Business
property

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 17

Decision Date: 4-16-26

Property Owner/Agent: Zachary Putter / Putter Engineering Firm LLC

Property Type & Location: Personal Property, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: 174 South Street -> Rented fully furnished suite Office Suites
Does not business at his house, but should have filed as a lease

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

☒ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal
OR

☐ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED / DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous	☒
Daniel DeGray	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	<u>1680</u>	<u>670</u>	<u>-1010</u>
Totals	<u>1680</u>	<u>670</u>	<u>-1010</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 8

Decision Date: 4/16/26

Property Owner/Agent: Laura + Keith Peterson

Property Type & Location: 22 Bright Street, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Claim don't have half bath & finished basement

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

☒ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal
OR

☐ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED / DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous	
Daniel DeGray	☒ Yay ☐ Nay
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>56,600</u>	<u>56,600</u>	<u>- 0 -</u>
Building	<u>130,300</u>	<u>105,800</u>	<u>- 24,500</u>
Out Buildings	<u>7,800</u>	<u>7,800</u>	<u>0</u>
Personal Property			
Totals	<u>194,700</u>	<u>170,200</u>	<u>- 24,500</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 9

Decision Date: 4-16-26

Property Owner/Agent: Scott DeBorge for Margaret Hupfer

Property Type & Location: 14 Vail Estates, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Showed photos of space being unfinished.

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

☒ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

OR

☐ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Assessor to re-calculate the card with the finished basement of 250sf removed. concrete walls, floor concrete and no heat in basement it does have a ceiling.

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray ☒ Yay ☐ Nay

Lori Longhi ☐ Yay ☐ Nay

Andrew Urbanowicz ☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land			
Building	<u>108,100</u>	<u>103,700</u>	<u>-4,400</u>
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	<u>108,100</u>	<u>103,700</u>	<u>-4,400</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 10

Decision Date: 4/16/2026

Property Owner/Agent: Donna Poyker

Property Type & Location: Personal Property, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Some excavator date got mixed up. Original Assessment + reduce penalty accordingly.

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

☒ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal
OR

☐ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED / DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous	
Daniel DeGray	☒ Yay ☐ Nay
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	<u>18380</u>	<u>5250</u>	<u>-13130</u>
Totals	<u>18380</u>	<u>5250</u>	<u>-13130</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 20

Decision Date: 4/16/2026

Property Owner/Agent: Gaetano Marino Odin's Keep Axe House

Property Type & Location: Personal Property, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Asking to reduce penalty due to bookkeeper failure to file.

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

☒ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal
OR

☐ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED / DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous	☒
Daniel DeGray	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>156890</u>	<u>136890</u>	<u>-20000</u>
Totals	<u>156890</u>	<u>136890</u>	<u>-20000</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 12

Decision Date: 4/16/2026

Property Owner/Agent: Arc Best II Inc

Property Type & Location: Personal Property, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from:

Did not Appear

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

 HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

OR

✓ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

Land

Building

Out Buildings

Personal Property

Totals

Old Assessment

New Assessment

Difference

1530

1530

0

1530

1530

0

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 13

Decision Date: 4-16-2026

Property Owner/Agent: ABF FREIGHT SYSTEM INC

Property Type & Location: 7 Depot Hill Road, Enfield, CT
Personal Property

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from:

Did not appear

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

 HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

OR

☒ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>2021260</u>	<u>2021260</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>2021260</u>	<u>2021260</u>	<u>0</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 14

Decision Date: 4-16-2026

Property Owner/Agent: Bob Artoli

Property Type & Location: 101 Phoenix Ave, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: what they paid 1,400,000 for Both 1 of 4 people started lower. Had an appraisal showed us entire

made offers
rept. substantiated by purchase price
After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

☒ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

OR

☐ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous	☒
Daniel DeGray	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>152700</u>	<u>152700</u>	<u>0</u>
Building	<u>653200</u>	<u>73200</u>	<u>-580000</u>
Out Buildings	<u>14500</u>	<u>14500</u>	<u>0</u>
Personal Property			
Totals	<u>820400</u>	<u>240400</u>	<u>-580000</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 15

Decision Date: 4/18/2026

Property Owner/Agent: Bob Artoli

Property Type & Location: 103 Phoenix Ave, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: see Appeal #14

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

☒ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

OR

☐ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous	☒
Daniel DeGray	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>171,100</u>	<u>171,100</u>	<u>-0-</u>
Building	<u>455,000</u>	<u>55,000</u>	<u>-400,000</u>
Out Buildings	<u>54,800</u>	<u>54,800</u>	<u>-0-</u>
Personal Property			
Totals	<u>680,900</u>	<u>280,900</u>	<u>-400,000</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 21

Decision Date: 4/16/2026

Property Owner/Agent: Raffia Farms Inc

Property Type & Location: 983 Raffia Rd, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from:

With Drawn

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

_____ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal
OR

_____ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray _____ Yay _____ Nay

Lori Longhi _____ Yay _____ Nay

Andrew Urbanowicz _____ Yay _____ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	_____	_____	_____
Totals	_____	_____	_____

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 22

Decision Date: 4/16/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Christian Navarro & Melissa Weiner

Property Type & Location: 45 Lake Dr., Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Did not appear

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

☐ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

OR

☒ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED / ~~DENIED~~ ☒ by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

☒ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>51700</u>	<u>51700</u>	<u>0</u>
Building	<u>52900</u>	<u>52900</u>	<u>0</u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>104600</u>	<u>104600</u>	<u>0</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 23

Decision Date: 4-16-24

Property Owner/Agent: Timothy Herbst - Attorney

Property Type & Location: 100 Bright Meadow Ass. LLC, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Presented a paper on reasons why should be purchase price. Not enough documentation for us to reduce the assessment.

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

 HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

OR

✓ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>5841900</u>	<u>5841900</u>	<u>0</u>
Building	<u>16253600</u>	<u>16253600</u>	<u>0</u>
Out Buildings	<u>562500</u>	<u>562500</u>	<u>0</u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>22658000</u>	<u>22658000</u>	<u>0</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 24

Decision Date: 4/16/26

Property Owner/Agent: Catherine Salermi

Property Type & Location: 145 Hazard Ave, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: waive penalty (5390)
grant 5389

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

☒ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

OR

☐ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous	☒
Daniel DeGray	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>26,940</u>	<u>21,551</u>	<u>-5389</u>
Totals	<u>26,940</u>	<u>21,551</u>	<u>-5389</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 36
Multiple pieces

Decision Date: 4-16-26

Property Owner/Agent: CT Mulch Dist Kurt Lindeland & Carl Landolina
Property Type & Location: PP 70 Mullen Rd, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Reduced by 17,335 should be double 34,912 Boyout Chipper. Equip for grinder should be exempt under 12-81(76) because after 2011, they testified class 1 is 15 years not 10 years but its on manuf. Exemption form as 5 yr or 10 yr.
After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner Listed by applicant themselves exhibits

☒ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal
OR
☐ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous	☒
Daniel DeGray	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>3,205,344</u>	<u>3,176,684</u>	<u>-28,660</u>
Totals	<u>3,205,344</u>	<u>3,176,684</u>	<u>-28,660</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 37
Decision Date: 4/16/26

Property Owner/Agent: Kimberly Menti Ashley Groves
For Pine Grove Manor
Property Type & Location: 15 Grove Street, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter,
by way of oral testimony from: Low Income w/ sweat equity
CGS. § 24-143(9) based on cap value of net rental income

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

☒ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal
OR
☐ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous	☒	
Daniel DeGray	☐ Yay	☐ Nay
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay	☐ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay	☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>76500</u>	<u>76500</u>	<u>0</u>
Building	<u>528400</u>	<u>486834</u>	<u>-41566</u>
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	<u>604900</u>	<u>563334</u>	<u>-41566</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 41

Decision Date: 4/16/2026

Property Owner/Agent: Donald Lango

Property Type & Location: Personal Property, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Objects to valuation of
unregistered motor vehicles

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

 HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

OR

✓ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS ~~GRANTED~~ DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray Yay Nay

Lori Longhi Yay Nay

Andrew Urbanowicz Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>6589</u>	<u>6589</u>	<u>6</u>
Totals	<u>6589</u>	<u>6589</u>	<u>0</u>

2026 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 42

Decision Date: 4/16/26

Property Owner/Agent: William Moran

Property Type & Location: 10 Hudson Street R-E., Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Claims 100% VA disability, Submitted VA Form. Deadline 12/31/25 came in 1/12/26
He is VA 100% disabled.

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the above-referenced matter as more fully identified, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner

☒ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal
OR

☐ FAILED TO PROVE beyond a preponderance of evidence the merits of this Appeal

Motion to approve appeal made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray.

THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

☒ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>56900</u>	<u>56900</u>	<u>0</u>
Building	<u>139400</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-139400</u>
Out Buildings	<u>2200</u>	<u>2200</u>	<u>0</u>
Personal Property			
Totals	<u>198500</u>	<u>59100</u>	<u>-139400</u>