UNAPPROVED MINUTES
BOARD OF ASSESSMENT APPEALS
SPECIAL MEETING
TOWN LIBRARY
MARCH 28, 2024

12:00 P.M. – 2:00 P.M.

Chairman Longhi called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call – Lori Longhi, Andrew Urbanowicz & Donna Dubanoski were present.

2. Other organizational matters as may be brought up by the board, discuss minutes.

3. Assessment Appeals, deliberations, and or decisions on the October 1, 2023 Grand List.

Issues from the hearings were discussed by the members. Andrew Urbanowicz went over the below information with the other two board members:

14 Grove Street/Deborah L. Young

This appeal was presented to the BAA with a print out from the Greater Hartford MLS system of the listing for the subject property attached. This listing was not provided by the appellant. While the person who attached it is not known, this listing was printed from Asst. Assessor Tyler Devine's MLS account with Coldwell Banker Realty. As a licensed real estate broker in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and a signatory to an analogous MLS participant agreement, Andrew thought such use by Town staff of the MLS system and its proprietary data as argument for an assessment was outside the terms of the MLS license for MLS data, and highly irregular.

It was confirmed with a Connecticut real estate broker that such use of proprietary MLS data runs contrary to the MLS Contract provisions. Specifically, MLS Agreement Article 6.1 prohibits the sharing of MLS information with non-participants, and by attaching to a public document this information has been shared with the general public. Additionally, said use violated MLS Agreement Article 9.1 which requires that MLS data be kept confidential, and in fact, expressly prohibits its use for appraisal purposes, and from sharing with non participants. Using for valuation for tax assessment falls within this prohibition. Lastly, the use of this MLS data violated MLS Agreement Article 11.1 with regard to distribution for a use outside the subscriber's licensed activity. As the user, in this case holds a real estate sales license, he may only make use of MLS data for the purposes of real estate sales through his brokerage, not for external categories for which he does not hold a license.

Aside from this improper use of MLS data, it should be noted that it would be flawed to rely solely upon the data contained in an MLS listing as the data is only as good as the job done by the listing agent when the data was entered into MLS. An appraiser using MLS data, would need to make further inquiry to verify this data before using in an appraisal. This is why MLS data is not a substitute for an appraisal. Chairman Longhi concurred with this observation as being substantially correct.

As to this appeal, the BAA should not consider the MLS data in its decision on this property due to all of the foregoing issues, in addition to the fact that such use would violate the due process rights of the appellant due to both notice and opportunity to be heard in rebuttal.

PA-490 "Revisions"

The BAA heard numerous appeals which concerned "revisions" being made to PA490 enrolled properties which were already the subject of past decisions of the BAA. Some of these revisions included changes to the assessments, while others were a refusal to reinstate enrollment in PA490 where the board had previously voted that the termination of said enrollment had been without merit and voted to restore said enrollment.

A decision from the local board of assessment appeals regarding the merits of a property tax assessments considered a final decision. CGS§ 12-111(a)(3) states in substantive part that "The board shall determine all appeals for which the board conducts an appeal hearing and send written notification of the final determination of such appeals to each such person within one week after such determination has been made." When the board of assessment appeals rules against a taxpayer and upholds an assessment, the taxpayer has a statutory right to appeal the board's decision to the Superior Court. When a board of assessment appeals does the opposite, and rules for the taxpayer, however, the board's decision is final and binding upon the municipality and its agents. There are no statutes in Chapter 203 of the Connecticut General Statutes that permit an assessor to appeal the decision of the board of assessment appeals to the Superior Courts. See, e.g., CGS§ 12-111 (establishing a right of appeal for the taxpayer, but not the tax assessor); CGS§ 12-1 17a (same); CGS§ 12-1 19 (same). The law is clear that when a board of assessment appeals decides in favor of the position of a taxpayer regarding an assessment, that board is speaking with the full voice, power, and authority of said municipality. There is no statutory authority that permits another agent of that municipality, even the assessor, to overturn or challenge the decision of the board. No statutory authority permits a property tax assessor to circumvent the assessment appeals process thereby unilaterally rejecting the final decisions of a board of assessment appeals, when no material changes to the assessed properties have occurred.

The Connecticut Courts have never ruled on the legality of a town property assessor's attempted nullification of a board of assessment appeals' final decision after that board found for the taxpayer. One could infer, that since this would be a matter of first impression on the Courts, that no other assessor has

ever run in complete contradiction to the ordinary and plain meaning of the controlling statutes, likely because the ordinary and plain meaning is so clear. The assessor relies heavily upon CGS§12-111(a)(4) for his "revision" authority. This statute reads as follows:
When the board increases or decreases the gross assessment of any taxable real property or interest therein, the amount of such gross assessment shall be fixed until the assessment year in which the municipality next implements a revaluation of all real property pursuant to section 12-62, unless the assessor increases or decreases the gross assessment of the property to (A) comply with an order of a court of jurisdiction, (B) reflect an addition for new construction, (C) reflect a reduction for damage or demolition, or (D) correct a factual error by issuance of a certificate of correction. Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, if, prior to the next revaluation, the assessor increases or decreases a gross assessment established by the board for any other reason, the assessor shall submit a written explanation to the board setting forth the reason for such increase or decrease. The assessor shall also append the written explanation to the property card for the real estate parcel whose gross assessment was increased or decreased.

This statute very clearly does not allow the assessor to revise the assessment of a property without a change in conditions that affects the value of the property. Those change in conditions are outlined in (A) through (D) of the above statute. None of those conditions occurred with respect to the numerous PA490 "revisions" which were appealed to the BAA.

The assessor also heavily relies upon CGS§12-55. The statute allows the town property assessor wide latitude to "equalize the assessments of property in the town, if necessary," to "make any assessment omitted by mistake or required by law," and to "increase or decrease the valuation of any property as reflected in the last-preceding grand list". For an assessor to act pursuant to this statute, there must be some actual substantive change in the value of the property justifying an interim assessment. See, e.g., Kostowski v. City of Norwalk, 2013 Conn. Super. LEXIS 1 109, *14 - *15 (Jud. Dist. Stamford-Norwalk, May 16, 2013) ("The court agrees that the tax assessor or Board of Assessment Appeals may raise or lower property valuations after a tax appeal has set the fair market value for one year. But there are two caveats. This change in the property must result in some actual change in valuation see also CGS§ 12-62 (disallowing interim assessments made solely due to changes in market conditions). Where no such change exists, the interim assessment cannot stand. See Kostowski, supra. (finding that a town could not increase a property tax assessment without a legal basis to raise the value of the property after the taxpayers had their assessment fixed in a prior appeal).
For the properties that came before the BAA, both prongs of the above test were not met. The were no actual changes in the property, and since there were no changes, there would not have been a change in valuation.

Because of the foregoing, it is the belief of the BAA that they are forced to decide these properties as it has previously, even though the reason for the parties' appeal to the BAA were due to self-granted extra-judicial authority of the

assessor which exceeded the powers granted to the assessor by the Connecticut General Statutes.

Correcting Errors / Exempt Properties

The BAA had several repeat exempt properties appealing for the third time concerning exempt properties. The Connecticut General Statutes Sec. 12-81 (7) states as follows:
"The following-described property shall be exempt from taxation:
(7) Property used for scientific, educational, literary, historical, charitable or open space land preservation purposes. Exception. (A) Subject to the provisions of sections 12-87 and 12-88, the real property of, or held in trust for, a corporation organized exclusively for scientific, educational, literary, historical or charitable purposes or for two or more such purposes and used exclusively for carrying out one or more of such purposes or for the purpose of preserving open space land, as defined in section 12-107b, for any of the uses specified in said section, that is owned by any such corporation, and the personal property of, or held in trust for, any such corporation, provided (i) any officer, member or employee thereof does not receive or at any future time shall not receive any pecuniary profit from the operations thereof, except reasonable compensation for services in effecting one or more of such purposes or as proper beneficiary of its strictly charitable purposes, and (ii) in 1965, and quadrennially thereafter, a statement shall be filed on or before November first with the assessor or board of assessors of any town, consolidated town and city or consolidated town and borough, in which any of its property claimed to be exempt is situated. Such statement shall be filed on a form provided by such assessor or board of assessors. Such form shall be posted on the Internet web site of such assessor or board of assessors, if applicable. The real property shall be eligible for the exemption regardless of whether it is used by another corporation organized exclusively for scientific, educational, literary, historical or charitable purposes or for two or more such purposes"

The appellants which came before the BAA certainly met the definition of the above statute, but found themselves before the board initially due to an error. The BAA has authority, as does the assessor, to correct errors from CGS§ 12-60 which states: "Any clerical omission or mistake in the assessment of taxes may be corrected according to the fact by the assessors or board of assessment appeals, not later than three years following the tax due date relative to which such omission or mistake occurred, and the tax shall be levied and collected according to such corrected assessment. In the event that the issuance of a certificate of correction results in an increase to the assessment list of any person, written notice of such increase shall be sent to such person's last-known address by the assessor or board of assessment appeals within ten days immediately following the date such correction is made. Such notice shall include, with respect to each assessment list corrected, the assessment prior to and after such increase and the reason for such increase. Any person claiming to be aggrieved by the action of the assessor under this section may appeal the doings of the assessor to the board of assessment appeals as otherwise provided in this chapter, provided such appeal shall be extended in time to the next succeeding board of assessment appeals if the meetings of such board for

the grand list have passed. Any person intending to so appeal to the board of assessment appeals may indicate that taxes paid by him for any additional assessment added in accordance with this section, during the pendency of such appeal, are paid "under protest" and thereupon such person shall not be liable for any interest on the taxes based upon such additional assessment, provided (1) such person shall have paid not less than seventy-five per cent of the amount of such taxes within the time specified or (2) the board of assessment appeals reduces valuation or removes items of property from the list of such person so that there is no tax liability related to additional assessment."

For the appeals on this issue, the BAA has previously corrected the clerical errors and ruled on behalf of the appellants. As previously discussed, relative to the PA-490 issues above, BAA decisions are the final voice of the Town, and therefore errors corrected by the BAA should be corrected in the records of the assessor.

If there is an unwillingness on the part of the assessor to correct these errors, then all the appellants have remaining are their rights under CGS § 12-119 which states "When it is claimed that a tax has been laid on property not taxable in the town or city in whose tax list such property was set, or that a tax laid on property was computed on an assessment which, under all the circumstances, was manifestly excessive and could not have been arrived at except by disregarding the provisions of the statutes for determining the valuation of such property, the owner thereof or any lessee thereof whose lease has been recorded as provided in section 47-19 and who is bound under the terms of his lease to pay real property taxes, prior to the payment of such tax, may, in addition to the other remedies provided by law, make application for relief to the superior court for the judicial district in which such town or city is situated. Such application may be made within one year from the date as of which the property was last evaluated for purposes of taxation and shall be served and returned in the same manner as is required in the case of a summons in a civil action, and the pendency of such application shall not suspend action upon the tax against the applicant. In all such actions, the Superior Court shall have power to grant such relief upon such terms and in such manner and form as to justice and equity appertains, and costs may be taxed at the discretion of the court. If such assessment is reduced by said court, the applicant shall be reimbursed by the town or city for any overpayment of taxes in accordance with the judgment of said court."

Chairman Longhi began a discussion about the field cards and for the second year in a row the BAA has heard a wide spread complaints that the town was not fully updating the field cards to reflect the BAA decisions, the members discussed this issue and were determined to make it absolutely clear to the town that the cards need to be fully updated. They will put a specific note on each original appeal where the appellant and/or attorney brought it up at the hearing.

The board deliberated and made decisions on all 10-1-2023 Grand List Assessment Appeals heard during the month of March 2024. Following

deliberations, a Motion to Grant each Appeal was made by Lori Longhi, seconded by Donna Dubanoski and voted upon by all three BAA members.

BAA NOTE: There were some exceptions when Lori Longhi recused herself or Andrew Urbanowicz recused himself, each was absent for and did not participate in either deliberations or decision-making.

In each such recusal instance of Lori Longhi the Motion to Grant was made by Andrew Urbanowicz, seconded by Donna Dubanoski the voted upon on by Andrew Urbanowicz and Donna Dubanoski.

In each such recusal instance of Andrew Urbanowicz the Motion to Grant was made by Lori Longhi, seconded by Donna Dubanoski the voted upon on by Lori Longhi and Donna Dubanoski.

***Whenever applicable, said recusal by Lori Longhi or Andrew Urbanowicz are clearly identified.**

NOTE: Clerical Error Corrections to be made were voted on and identified on the original appeal form and in the decision minutes.

1. **Clerical to the 2021 Grand List the correction of the Loaves and Fishes Quadrennial Report Appeal 10.**

2. **Clerical Error Correction to be made to the 2021 and 2022 Grand List correcting a math error Jarmoc Farms, LLC Appeal 45**

The BAA heard evidence of retribution and repeated retribution by the town against Appellants as to each of their entities in all of their appeals. Those Appellants were identified and so noted on their respective appeal decision forms as well as these BAA 2024 decision minutes. "Evidence of Retribution by town against Appellants List".

Motion to adjourn made by Lori Longhi, seconded by Andrew Urbanowicz, motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Dubanoski

Donna Dubanoski
BAA Recording Secretary

Attachments:
1. BAA 2024 Decisions
2. Evidence of Retribution by Town against Appellants List

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 1

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Zubair Qureshi

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: No Show

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
Personal Property	MV	6950	6950	-0-
Totals		6950	6950	-0-

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 2

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: David Lindman

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ Motor Vehicle	50,160	43,000	-7160
Totals	50,160	43,000	-7160

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 3

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Kyle Mandia

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ M/V	33,471	25,385	-8086
Totals	33,471	25,385	-8086

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 4

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Zahida Farid

Property Type & Location: 1036 Enfield St **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	43,290	16,610	-26,680
Totals	43,290	16,410	-26,680

2020 - Correct personal property per Declaration filed

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 5

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Zahida Farid

Property Type & Location: 636 Enfield St **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

Relief (if any): _____

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	42,530	9,400	-33,130
Totals	42,530	9,400	-33,130

2021 - Correct Personal Property per declaration filed

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 6

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Zahida Farid

Property Type & Location: 634 Enfield St, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous ✓

Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay	____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay	____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay	____ Nay

Relief (if any): _____

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	39,910	6,270	-33,640
Totals	39,910	6,270	-33,640

Per declaration filed 2022 - Correct Personal Property

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 7

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: French Town LLC

Property Type & Location: 42 Tariff 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: Geoffry Kaplan

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	33600	25,725	-7875
Building	160300	130,725	-29,575
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	193,900	156,450	-37,450

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 8

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: French Town LLC

Property Type & Location: 48 Tariff St **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	32600	8575	-24025
Building	81800	43,575	-38225
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	114400	52,150	-62,250

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 9

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Multi Family LLC / Geoffrey Kaplan

Property Type & Location: 15 Cross 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: Geoffrey Kaplan

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	35,900	24,710	-11,190
Building	161,500	158,270	-3230
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	197,400	182,980	-14,420

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 10

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Enfield Loaves & Fishes Inc
Kelly Hemmeler

Property Type & Location: 28 Prospect St **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	41,700	Exempt	-41,700
Building	504,500	0	-504,500
Out Buildings	900	0	- 900
Personal Property			
Totals	547,100	0	-547,100

Correction of an ERROR on quadrennial revised report attached to appeal, granting Exemption CT General Statue 12-60

Sec. 12-60. Correction of clerical error in assessment. Any clerical omission or mistake in the assessment of taxes may be corrected according to the fact by the assessors or board of assessment appeals, not later than three years following the tax due date relative to which such omission or mistake occurred, and the tax shall be levied and collected according to such corrected assessment. In the event that the issuance of a certificate of correction results in an increase to the assessment list of any person, written notice of such increase shall be sent to such person's last-known address by the assessor or board of assessment appeals within ten days immediately following the date such correction is made. Such notice shall include, with respect to each assessment list corrected, the assessment prior to and after such increase and the reason for such increase. Any person claiming to be aggrieved by the action of the assessor under this section may appeal the doings of the assessor to the board of assessment appeals as otherwise provided in this chapter, provided such appeal shall be extended in time to the next succeeding board of assessment appeals if the meetings of such board for the grand list have passed. Any person intending to so appeal to the board of assessment appeals may indicate that taxes paid by him for any additional assessment added in accordance with this section, during the pendency of such appeal, are paid "under protest" and thereupon such person shall not be liable for any interest on the taxes based upon such additional assessment, provided (1) such person shall have paid not less than seventy-five per cent of the amount of such taxes within the time specified or (2) the board of assessment appeals reduces valuation or removes items of property from the list of such person so that there is no tax liability related to additional assessment.

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 11

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Enfield loaves + Fishes, Kelly Hemmeler

Property Type & Location: Prospect 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: Kelly Hemmeler, Joel Cox

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land		Exempt	
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals		-0-	

Correction of an ERROR on quadrennial/ Revised report attached. Town put no assessment information on form. BAA granted exemption status. and granted the 2023 appeal.

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 12

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Hinckley Construction, Inc.

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ M/V	19,000	19,000	0
Totals	19,000	19,000	0

* Cannot consider prior tax year.

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 13

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Hinckley Construction, Inc.

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ M/V	18,000	18,000	0
Totals	18,000	18,000	0

* Cannot by law consider prior year grand list appeals.

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 14

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Hinckley Construction, Inc.

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	18,000	3000	-15,000
Totals	18,000	3,000	-15,000

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 15

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Thomas Temosse

Property Type & Location: 94 Alden 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: _____

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	9,940	350	-9,590
Totals	9940	350	-9590

Antique - Filled form for 20 yr old already exemption of 500.00

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 16

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Angela & Jeff Foss

Property Type & Location: 16 Crescent Beach 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: _____

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓			
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay		
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay		2-0-1 vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay	✓ Recused	

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	72,500	72,500	-0-
Building	426,000	303,440	-122,560
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	498,500	375,940	-122,560

3rd year Retribution

Correct Field card

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 17

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Charles and Laura Elwood

Property Type & Location: 61 Willard Drive, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	59,600	59,600	0
Building	115,400	110,400	-5000
Out Buildings	2700	2700	0
Personal Property			
Totals	177,700	172,700	-5000

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 18

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Diane Stelmat

Property Type & Location: 18 Clear St **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ mv	4,290	1,900	-2,390
Totals	4,290	1,900	-2390

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 19

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Art Mullen

Property Type & Location: Mullen Road **, Enfield, CT**

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

25.80 acres of farm land - PA 490

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

Tax payer is aggrieved with inaccurate information on the current field card. Also prior BAA decisions were never updated on cards to reflect Farm, Farm Land - there is no lot on the 25.80 parcel.

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals			

Field Card needs to be changed to reflect PA490 property. It has previously been determined to be PA490 not vacant Residential Land.

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 20

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Robert W. Dean

Property Type & Location: 57 Kimberly Drive **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	52600	41,134	-11,466
Building	158,800	158,800	0
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	211,400	199,934	-11,466

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 21

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Peerless Tool & Machine CO. 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: Casimir Kruzel + Melissa Kruzel

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	1,132,950	115,540	-1,017,410
Totals	1,132,950	115,540	-1,017,410

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 22

Decision Date: 3-29,24

Property Owner/Agent: Henry Poku

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: NO SHOW

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
Personal Property	MV	10250	10,250	-0-
Totals		10250	10,250	-0-

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 23

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Henry Poku

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: NO SHOW

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
~~Out Buildings~~	MV	3680	3680	-0-
Personal Property				
Totals		3680	3680	-0-

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 24

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Audrey Szczesiul

Property Type & Location: 35 Fletcher Road, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	38,380	1600	-36,760
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	38,380	1,600	-36,760

* Board heard evidence of retribution by town against Audrey Szczesiul on this appeal, and evidence she was coerced to file M490 open space when property was a farm.

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 25

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Angela & Jeff Foss

Property Type & Location: 132 Pearl St. **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓			
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay		
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay		2-0-1 vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay	✓ Recused	

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	51,500	51,500	-0-
Building	139,600	135,500	-4,100
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	191,100	187,000	-4,100

Correct Field card to Reflect Above

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 26

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Scott & Kim Delorge

Property Type & Location: 336 George Washington, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	133,200	51,600	-81,600
Building	226,100	223,100	-3000
Out Buildings	53,200	36,900	-16,300
~~Personal Property~~ Farm Land		4,740	+4,740
Totals	412,500	316,340	-96,160

correct field card, repeated retribution, not a heated pool

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 27

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Ken + Scott DeLorge

Property Type & Location: 336 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: Scott DeLorge

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	24,430	10,300	-14,130
Totals	24,430	10,300	-14,130

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 28

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: 131 Town farm Rd LLC

Property Type & Location: Broad Brook 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: Owen
Att Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	19250	7310	-11940
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	19250	7310	-11,940

2024 Decision Board of Assessment Appeals
Grand List October 1, 2023

Appeal # 29
Decision Date: 3-28-24

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the matter of this appeal, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner Owen Jarnoc's Attorney Donnelly

✓ 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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski
THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay Recused

Farm Land	Code	River Valley	Acres	Amount	Appraised Amount	70% Assessed Amount
Tillable A	710	2,530				
Tillable B	711	1,810				
Tillable C	712	1,690	33	55,770		39,039
Tillable D	713	1,170				
Orchard E	714	990				
Pasture F	715	280				
Swamp, Ledge	716	40				
Scrub G	716	40	48.05	1940		1345
Woodland/Forest	717/610	390				
Open Space	718	1,690				
			81.05			
OTHER RELIEF ORDERED: This property be restored and reinstated to its prior P.A. 490 Status and classification(s) as existed on the 10-1-2020 Grand List with exception(s) only for the above assessment calculation(s) immediately.						
	TOTALS					40,385

	APPRAISED AMOUNT	10/1/2023 ASSESSMENT	10/1/2022 Assessment	10/1/2021 Assessment
Land	305,000	40,385		
Buildings				
Out Buildings				
Personal Property				

no imputed lot value - Excessive appraised value by town and use the classification as listed above up date field card to reflect BAA decisions.

2024 Decision Board of Assessment Appeals
Grand List October 1, 2023

Appeal # 30
Decision Date: 3-28-24

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the matter of this appeal, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner Owen Jarmoc + Attorney Donnelly

✓ 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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski
THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

	Unanimous			
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	____ Nay		
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	____ Nay		
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay	____ Nay	recused	

Farm Land	Code	River Valley	Acres	Amount	Appraised Amount	70% Assessed Amount
Tillable A	710	2,530				
Tillable B	711	1,810	13.8	24978	103,500	17,388
Tillable C	712	1,690	14	23660	105,000	16,562
Tillable D	713	1,170				
Orchard E	714	990				
Pasture F	715	280	2	560	15,000	392
Swamp, Ledge	716	40	28	1120	70,000	784
Scrub G	716	40				
Woodland/Forest	717/610	390				
~~Open Space~~ R88	~~718~~	~~1,690~~	2		87,119	60,983 *
						96,110
Pole Barn		3640 X 1.66		6042		4230
Pole Barn		2040 X 1.66		3386		2370
Pole Barn		4600 X 1.66		7636		5245
Pole Barn		2040 X 1.66		3386		2370
Pole Barn		7200 X 13.19		94,968		66,480
OTHER RELIEF ORDERED: This property be restored and reinstated to its prior P.A. 490 Status and classification(s) as existed on the 10-1-2020 Grand List with exception(s) only for the above assessment calculation(s) immediately.						
	TOTALS					

*ability on PDR to have one house - Lot value ok

	APPRAISED AMOUNT	10/1/2023 ASSESSMENT	10/1/2022 Assessment	10/1/2021 Assessment
Land	380,619	96,110		
Buildings				
Out Buildings	115,418	80,790		
Personal Property				
Total	496,037	176,900		

update field card to reflect BAA decisions on classifications and values above

2024 Decision Board of Assessment Appeals
Grand List October 1, 2023

Appeal # 31
Decision Date: 3-28-24

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the matter of this appeal, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner Owen Jarmoc & Att Donnelly

✓ 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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski
THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay	____ Nay Recused

Farm Land	Code	River Valley	Acres	Amount	Appraised Amount	70% Assessed Amount
Tillable A	710	2,530				
Tillable B	711	1,810	35.11	63,549	263,325	44,485
Tillable C	712	1,690				
Tillable D	713	1,170				
Orchard E	714	990				
Pasture F	715	280				
Swamp, Ledge	716	40				
Scrub G	716	40				
Woodland/Forest	717/610	390				
Open Space	718	1,690				
Pole Barn		5120 X 1.66			8499	5949
Pole Barn		5120X 1.66			8499	5949
Pole Barn		3062X 1.66			5083	3558
Pole Barn		7168X 1.66			11,899	8329
Pole Barn		7168 X 1.66			11,899	8329
Pole Barn		7168 X 13.2			94546	66,182
OTHER RELIEF ORDERED: This property be restored and reinstated to its prior P.A. 490 Status and classification(s) as existed on the 10-1-2020 Grand List with exception(s) only for the above assessment calculation(s) immediately.						
	TOTALS					

	APPRAISED AMOUNT	10/1/2023 ASSESSMENT	10/1/2022 Assessment	10/1/2021 Assessment
Land	263,325	44,485		
Buildings				
Out Buildings	140,425	98,300		
Personal Property				

remove imputed lot value on the parcel, BAA determined in prior year this was a farm with PA 490 classification Field Card needs to be update to reflect BAA decisions

2024 Decision Board of Assessment Appeals
Grand List October 1, 2023

Appeal # 32
Decision Date: 3-28-24

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the matter of this appeal, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner Broad Brook Rd East Owen Jarmoc

✓ 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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski
THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay	____ Nay RECUSED

Farm Land	Code	River Valley	Acres	Amount	Appraised Amount	Assessed Amount
Tillable A	710	2,530				
Tillable B	711	1,810	2.5	4525		3,170
Tillable C	712	1,690				
Tillable D	713	1,170				
Orchard E	714	990				
Pasture F	715	280				
Swamp, Ledge	716	40				
Scrub G	716	40				
Woodland/Forest	717/610	390				
Open Space	718	1,690				
Non-classified Farm Land	7500		1.23	9225		6460
Pole Barn	4096sf@1.66sf			6800	6800	4,760
OTHER RELIEF ORDERED: This property be restored and reinstated to its prior P.A. 490 Status and classification(s) as existed on the 10-1-2020 Grand List with exception(s) only for the above assessment calculation(s) immediately.						
	TOTALS					

Total Land 9630

Barn

	APPRAISED AMOUNT		10/1/2023 ASSESSMENT	10/1/2022 Assessment	10/1/2021 Assessment
Land	56,600	All Farm Land	9630		
Buildings					
Out Buildings	6800		4760		
Personal Property	66,400		14,390		

Update Field cards to reflect barn & Land values per BAA Decisions - Remove Imputed lot value no lot on farm land. Applicant should update farm application if its not done. No corr in Appeal

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 33

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: 128 Moody Rd - Owen Tarmac Attorney Donnelly

Property Type & Location: 128 Moody 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: Owen & Derek

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	31200	31,250	-50
Building	702900	573,860	-129,040
Out Buildings	300100	93,890	-206,210
Personal Property			
Totals	1034200	699,000	-335,250

Retribution by town, town needs to update field cards to reflect BAA decisions. Appeal 2022, #278 pg 1+2 has correct land & Building details

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 34

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Farms

Property Type & Location: Grant Road **, Enfield, CT**

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmoc
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	14680	11,700	-2980
Building			
Out Buildings	279,600	101,000	-178,600
Personal Property			
Totals	294,280	112,700	-181,580

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 35

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Grant Road Farm LLC

Property Type & Location: _____, **Enfield, CT**

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmoc
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay __✓__ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay __✓__ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	16040	16040	-0-
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	16040	16040	-0-

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 36

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Farms & Jarmoc Real Estate LLC

Property Type & Location: Broad Brook Road **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	359,200	-0-	-359,200
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	359,200	-0-	-359,200

repeated retribution by town

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 37

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Farms & Jarmoc Real Estate
Owen Jarmoc & Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: _____, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	614,300	-0-	614,300
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	614,300	-0-	614,300

Part of a tax Stabilization Agreement

– Repeated Retribution by town –

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 38

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Farms & Jarmoc Real Estate
Owen Jarmoc

Property Type & Location: 65 Broadbrook 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: Owen Jarmoc
Attorney Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay	RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	891100	0	-891,100
Building	258900	0	-258,900
Out Buildings	130900	0	-130,900
Personal Property			
Totals	1280900	0	-1280900

Part of a tax Stablization agreement with town.
BAA heard evidence of repeated retribution

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 39

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Farms & Jarmoc Real Estate
Owen Jarmoc & Derrek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: 69 Broad Brook 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: Owen
Atd. Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay	RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	58,800	-0-	-58,000
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	58,800	-0-	-58000

Town merged Lot into 102/49 which is part of a tax Stabilization agreement

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 40

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Real Estate Owen Jarmoc

Property Type & Location: Broad Brook 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: Owen Jarmoc
Attorney Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	19890	19,346	-544
Building			
Out Buildings	411500	93514	-317,986
Personal Property			
Totals	431,390	112,860	-318,530

Evidence of Repeated Retribution by Town
ALSO FIELD CARDS Need to Be updated to reflect BAA Decisions. BAA 2022 Classification of Land & Barns IS correct and FIELD CARD are to Be updated. LL

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 41

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Real Estate Owen Jaemoc

Property Type & Location: Broad Brook Road **, Enfield, CT**

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jaemoc
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____	
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay	__✓__ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay	__✓__ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	1480	1480	-0-
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	1480	1480	

2024 Decision Board of Assessment Appeals **Appeal #** 42
Grand List October 1, 2023 **Decision Date:** 3-28-24

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the matter of this appeal, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner Jarmoc Real Estate

✓ 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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski
THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay	____ Nay RECUSED

Farm Land	Code	River Valley	Acres	Amount	Appraised Amount	Assessed Amount
Tillable A	710	2,530				
Tillable B	711	1,810	18	32,580	135,000	22,806
Tillable C	712	1,690	2	3,380	15,000	2,366
Tillable D	713	1,170	7.44	8,705	55,800	6094
Orchard E	714	990				
Pasture F	715	280				
Swamp, Ledge	716	40				
Scrub G	716	40				
Woodland/Forest	717/610	390				
Open Space	718	1,690				
Pole Barn		5120 x 1.66		8499	8499	5950
Pole Barn		5120 x 1.66		8499	8499	5950
Pole Barn		4096 1.66		6799	6799	4760
Pole Barn		4096 1.66		6799	6799	4760
Pole Barn		6272 1.66		10,412	10,412	7290
New Holland Building		6000 SF x 15.00		90,000	90,000	63,000
OTHER RELIEF ORDERED: This property be restored and reinstated to its prior P.A. 490 Status and classification(s) as existed on the 10-1-2020 Grand List with exception(s) only for the above assessment calculation(s) immediately.						31,266 Land
	TOTALS		27.44		131,008	91,710 Bldgs

Remove imputed lot value from Field Card update Barn sales on Field card

	APPRAISED AMOUNT	10/1/2023 ASSESSMENT	10/1/2022 Assessment	10/1/2021 Assessment
Land	205,800	31,265		
Buildings				
Out Buildings	131,008	91,710		
Personal Property	336,808	122,975		

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 43

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Real Estate

Property Type & Location: 147 Abbe 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: Owen Jarmoc
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	38800	38755	-45
Building	210000	210000	210,000
Out Buildings	9800	9800	9800
Personal Property			
Totals	258600	258,555	-45

Heard Repeated Retribution by town - Need to update Field Cards to reflect BAA decisions, values, FMV and PA490 Classifications

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 44

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Farms LLC

Property Type & Location: Taft Lane ROW **, Enfield, CT**

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmoc
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ✓ Nay	
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ✓ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay	RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	1200	1200	-0-
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	1200	1200	-0-

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 45

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tarma

Property Type & Location: 21 Abbe 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: A Jarmoc
PH. D Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	51,700	45619	-6081
Building	46 800	46842	+42
Out Buildings	6 100	6090	-10
Personal Property			
Totals	104,600	98,551	-6049

Correction of a MATH ERROR ON The 2022 BAA Decision Sheet. UPDATE FIELD CARDS Retribution Statue 12-60

Sec. 12-60. Correction of clerical error in assessment. Any clerical omission or mistake in the assessment of taxes may be corrected according to the fact by the assessors or board of assessment appeals, not later than three years following the tax due date relative to which such omission or mistake occurred, and the tax shall be levied and collected according to such corrected assessment. In the event that the issuance of a certificate of correction results in an increase to the assessment list of any person, written notice of such increase shall be sent to such person's last-known address by the assessor or board of assessment appeals within ten days immediately following the date such correction is made. Such notice shall include, with respect to each assessment list corrected, the assessment prior to and after such increase and the reason for such increase. Any person claiming to be aggrieved by the action of the assessor under this section may appeal the doings of the assessor to the board of assessment appeals as otherwise provided in this chapter, provided such appeal shall be extended in time to the next succeeding board of assessment appeals if the meetings of such board for the grand list have passed. Any person intending to so appeal to the board of assessment appeals may indicate that taxes paid by him for any additional assessment added in accordance with this section, during the pendency of such appeal, are paid "under protest" and thereupon such person shall not be liable for any interest on the taxes based upon such additional assessment, provided (1) such person shall have paid not less than seventy-five per cent of the amount of such taxes within the time specified or (2) the board of assessment appeals reduces valuation or removes items of property from the list of such person so that there is no tax liability related to additional assessment.

2024 Decision Board of Assessment Appeals
Grand List October 1, 2023

Appeal # 46
Decision Date: 3-28-24

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the matter of this appeal, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner Jarmoc Farms LLC

✓ 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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski
THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay	____ Nay RECUSED

Farm Land	Code	River Valley	Acres	Amount	Appraised Amount	Assessed Amount
Tillable A	710	2,530				
Tillable B	711	1,810				
Tillable C	712	1,690	8	13520	60,000	9464
Tillable D	713	1,170				
Orchard E	714	990				
Pasture F	715	280				
Swamp, Ledge	716	40	2.91	116.4	21,825	80
Scrub G	716	40				
Woodland/Forest	717/610	390				
Open Space	718	1,690				
OTHER RELIEF ORDERED: This property be restored and reinstated to its prior P.A. 490 Status and classification(s) as existed on the 10-1-2020 Grand List with exception(s) only for the above assessment calculation(s) immediately.						
	TOTALS				81,825	9544

Dev. Farm

	APPRAISED AMOUNT	10/1/2023 ASSESSMENT	10/1/2022 Assessment	10/1/2021 Assessment
Land	81,825	9545		
Buildings				
Out Buildings				
Personal Property				

Update Field Card to properly reflect BAA decions and values with class of land etc. Appraised amounts never have been updated by town. Parcel is tillable C Not A with swamp/scrub.

2024 Decision Board of Assessment Appeals
Grand List October 1, 2023

Appeal # 47
Decision Date: 3-28-24

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the matter of this appeal, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner Jarmoc Farms

✓ 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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski
THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay	____ Nay RECUSED

Farm Land	Code	River Valley	Acres	Amount	Appraised Amount	Assessed Amount
Tillable A	710	2,530				
Tillable B	711	1,810	8	14,480	60,000	10,135
Tillable C	712	1,690	6.97	11,779	52,275	8245
Tillable D	713	1,170				
Orchard E	714	990				
Pasture F	715	280				
Swamp, Ledge	716	40				
Scrub G	716	40	10	160	10,000	112
Woodland/Forest	717/610	390				
Open Space	718	1,690				
Pole Barn		6144 X 1.66		10,199	10,200	7140
Pole Barn		6144 X 1.66		10,199	10,200	7140
Pole Barn		6144 X 1.66		10.199	10.200	7140
OTHER RELIEF ORDERED: This property be restored and reinstated to its prior P.A. 490 Status and classification(s) as existed on the 10-1-2020 Grand List with exception(s) only for the above assessment calculation(s) immediately.						
	TOTALS					

	APPRAISED AMOUNT	10/1/2023 ASSESSMENT	10/1/2022 Assessment	10/1/2021 Assessment
Land	122,275	18,500	18.500	
Buildings				
Out Buildings	30600	21'420	21 400	
Personal Property	210,500	39 920	39,900	

UPDATE FIELD CARD TO REFLECT correct Land Classes PER BAA DECESIONS and Barn values

2024 Decision Board of Assessment Appeals
Grand List October 1, 2023

Appeal # 48
Decision Date: 3-28-24

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the matter of this appeal, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner Jarmoc Farms

✓ 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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski
THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay	____ Nay RECUSED

Farm Land	Code	River Valley	Acres	Amount	Appraised Amount	Assessed Amount
Tillable A	710	2,530				
Tillable B	711	1,810				
Tillable C	712	1,690	18.74	31,670	140,550	22,170
Tillable D	713	1,170				
Orchard E	714	990				
Pasture F	715	280				
Swamp, Ledge	716	40				
Scrub G	716	40				
Woodland/Forest	717/610	390	2.02	787.80	5000	550
Open Space	718	1,690				
1 Story Barn		3200 X 1.66		5312	5312	3718
Metal Farm Bldg		13420 X 12.25		82,200	82,200	57,540
No Commercial Land, The property is a development restricted land parcel that is all being Farmed						
OTHER RELIEF ORDERED: This property be restored and reinstated to its prior P.A. 490 Status and classification(s) as existed on the 10-1-2020 Grand List with exception(s) only for the above assessment calculation(s) immediately.						
	TOTALS					

	APPRAISED AMOUNT	10/1/2023 ASSESSMENT	10/1/2022 Assessment	10/1/2021 Assessment
Land	145,500	22,720		
Buildings	82,200	57,540		
Out Buildings	5312	3,718		
~~Personal Property~~				
	233,062	87,978		

UPDATE FIELD CARD TO REFLECT BAA DECISIONS on land classes and values.

2024 Decision Board of Assessment Appeals
Grand List October 1, 2023

Appeal # 49
Decision Date: 3-28-24

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the matter of this appeal, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner Jarmoc Farms

✓ 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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski
THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous _____

Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay	____ Nay RECUSED

NOTE: Forest can be reduced as long as parcel over 10 ac, contiguous and totals over 25 acres

Farm Land	Code	River Valley	Acres	Amount	Appraised Amount	70% Assessed Amount
Tillable A	710	2,530				
Tillable B	711	1,810	34	61,540	255,000	43,078
Tillable C	712	1,690				
Tillable D	713	1,170				
Orchard E	714	990				
Pasture F	715	280				
Swamp, Ledge	716	40	12.50	500	93,750	350
Scrub G	716	40				
Woodland/Forest	717/610	390	29.91	11,665	234,325	8,165
Open Space	718	1,690				
Pole Barn		6/44 x 1.66		10199	10,200	7140
Pole Barn		6/44 x 1.66		10199	10,200	7140
Pole Barn		5/20 x 1.66		8499	8500	5950
Pole Barn		5/20 x 1.66		8499	8500	5950
Pole Barn	newer	6/44 x 13.19		81,039	81,039	56,727
Pole Barn	newer	6/44 x 13.19		81039	81,039	56,727
OTHER RELIEF ORDERED: This property be restored and reinstated to its prior P.A. 490 Status and classification(s) as existed on the 10-1-2020 Grand List with exception(s) only for the above assessment calculation(s) immediately.						
	TOTALS	*	76.41			

*Town using wrong ACERAGE of 87ac - Correct is 76.41 Development Rights SOLD

	APPRAISED AMOUNT	10/1/2023 ASSESSMENT	10/1/2022 Assessment	10/1/2021 Assessment
Land	573,075	51,593		
Buildings				
Out Buildings	199,478	139,634		
Personal Property				
	772,553	191,227		

Town has Value excessive USE BAA Values

UPDATE FIELD CARD TO REFLECT BAA DECISIONS ABOVE TO INCLUDE LAND CLASSES, VALUES, BARN VALUES

2024 Decision Board of Assessment Appeals
Grand List October 1, 2023

Appeal # 50
Decision Date: 3-28-24

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the matter of this appeal, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner JARMOC
Owen Jarmoc

✓ 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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski
THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay	____ Nay RECUSED

Farm Land	Code	River Valley	Acres	Amount	Appraised Amount	Assessed Amount
Tillable A	710	2,530				
Tillable B	711	1,810				
Tillable C	712	1,690	14.7	24,843	110,250	17390
Tillable D	713	1,170				
Orchard E	714	990				
Pasture F	715	280				
Swamp, Ledge	716	40				
Scrub G	716	40	14.22	568.80	106,650	570
Woodland/Forest	717/610	390				
Open Space	718	1,690				
Interior Land with development rights sold BAA decision of 5/08/22 approved Farm land as above. Complies with PA 490 Statues						
OTHER RELIEF ORDERED: This property be restored and reinstated to its prior P.A. 490 Status and classification(s) as existed on the 10-1-2020 Grand List with exception(s) only for the above assessment calculation(s) immediately.						
	TOTALS		28.92			

	APPRAISED AMOUNT	10/1/2023 ASSESSMENT	10/1/2022 Assessment	10/1/2021 Assessment
Land	216,900	17,960		
Buildings				
Out Buildings				
Personal Property	216,900	17,960		

UPDATE Field cards to reflect BAA decisions as above.

2024 Decision Board of Assessment Appeals
Grand List October 1, 2023

Appeal # 51
Decision Date: 3-28-24

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the matter of this appeal, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner Jarmoc Farms
Owen Jarmoc

✓ 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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski
THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS (GRANTED)/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay	____ Nay RECUSED

Farm Land	Code	River Valley	Acres	Amount	Appraised Amount	Assessed Amount
Tillable A	710	2,530				
Tillable B	711	1,810				
Tillable C	712	1,690	9.7	16393	72,750	11,475
Tillable D	713	1,170				
Orchard E	714	990				
Pasture F	715	280				
Swamp, Ledge	716	40				
Scrub G	716	40	4.27	171	32,025	120
Woodland/Forest	717/610	390				
Open Space	718	1,690				
OTHER RELIEF ORDERED: This property be restored and reinstated to its prior P.A. 490 Status and classification(s) as existed on the 10-1-2020 Grand List with exception(s) only for the above assessment calculation(s) immediately.						
	TOTALS		13.97		104775	

	APPRAISED AMOUNT	10/1/2023 ASSESSMENT	10/1/2022 Assessment	10/1/2021 Assessment
Land	104,775	11,595		
Buildings				
Out Buildings				
Personal Property	104,775			
		11,595		

UPDATE FIELD CARD TO REFECT BAA DECISIONS. TO include Land Classifications.

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 52

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tabacco LLC

Property Type & Location: Broad Brook 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: _____

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay	2-0-1 vote
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay	Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	21,820	12,488	-9,332
Totals	21,820	12,488	-9,332

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 53

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Farms

Property Type & Location: 128 Moody 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: _____

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay	2-0-1 Vote
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay	Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	28,800	-0-	-28,800
Totals	28,800	-0-	-28,800

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 54

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Transportation, Owen Jarmoc
Att, Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmoc & Attorney Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		2-0-1 Vote
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay	Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	204,530	-0-	-204,530
Totals	204,530	-0-	-204,530

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 55

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Enfield Gas Realty LLC

Property Type & Location: 241 Hazard Avenue **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	141 800	141800	0
Building	189,700	163,900	-25,800
Out Buildings	12,500	12,500	0
Personal Property			
Totals	344,000	318,200	-25,800

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 56 ✓

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Carl Landolina / Kurt Lindeland

Property Type & Location: 36 Muller 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:~~ Kurt

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	376,920	63120	-313,800
Building	192,400	192,400	-0-
Out Buildings	31,200	31,200	-0-
~~Personal Property~~ Farm Land		19,770	19,770
Totals See Attached Breakout	600,520	306,490	-294,030

Please correct the Field card - PA 490 changes

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 57

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Lindeland, Brenda & Kenneth

Property Type & Location: 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: Carl Landolina, K Lindeland

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land → Break out *See Farm sheet Attached	503,780	150,735	-353,045
Building	120,800	120,800	-0-
Out Buildings	87,300	5,330	-81,970
Personal Property			
Totals	711,800	276,865	-435,015

Please Correct PA490 Land break out as per attached.

Please Correct Field Card

2024 Decision Board of Assessment Appeals
Grand List October 1, 2023

Appeal # 57
Decision Date: 3/28/24

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the matter of this appeal, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner Lindeland, 70 Mullen Rd

✓ 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 ~~Lori Longhi~~ and seconded by Donna Dubanoski
THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous	3-0	
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay	____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay	____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay	____ Nay

Farm Land	Code	River Valley	Acres	Amount	Appraised Amount	Assessed Amount
Tillable A	710	2,530				
Tillable B	711	1,810				
Tillable C	712	1,690	48.25	57,080	81,542.50	57,079.75
Tillable D	713	1,170				
Orchard E	714	990				
Pasture F	715	280	5.00	980	1,400.00	980
Swamp, Ledge	716	40				
Scrub G	716	40				
Woodland/Forest	717/610	390	4.34	1185	1,692.60	1184.82
Open Space	718	1,690				
OTHER RELIEF ORDERED: This property be restored and reinstated to its prior P.A. 490 Status and classification(s) as existed on the 10-1-2020 Grand List with exception(s) only for the above assessment calculation(s) immediately.						
	TOTALS	Farm Land		59,245		

	~~APPRAISED~~ AMOUNT	10/1/2023 ASSESSMENT	~~10/1/2022~~ Assessment	~~10/1/2021~~ Assessment
Land		91,490		
Buildings		120,800		
Out Buildings		5,330		
~~Personal Property~~ Farm Land		59,245		
TOTAL		276,865		

Please correct Farm Land to the Above amount. Be sure to correct Field Card

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 58

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Carl Landolina / Kurt Lindeland

Property Type & Location: 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: _____

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	775,260	-0-	-775,260
Totals	775,260	-0- EXEMPT	-775,260

Retribution -

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 59

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

Having been duly ~~sworn~~, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmoc
~~Att~~ Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay Recused

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
Personal Property	MV	17470	5250	-12,220
Totals		17470	5250	-12,220

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 60

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmoc
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	6690	350	-6340
Totals	6690	350	-6340

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 01

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

Having been duly ~~sworn~~, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmoc
~~Att~~ Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	4920	350	-4570
Totals	4920	350	-4570

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 62

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmoc
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	6750	350	-6400
Totals	6750	350	-6400

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 63

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

Having been duly ~~sworn~~, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmac
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay Recused

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
Personal Property	MV	6000	350	-5650
Totals		6000	350	-5650

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 64

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmac
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	25,380	5250	-20,130
Totals	25380	5250	-20,130

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 65

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

Having been duly ~~sworn~~, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmac
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	25380	5250	-20,130
Totals	25380	5250	-20,130

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 66

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

Having been duly ~~sworn~~, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmac
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	15610	5250	-10,360
Totals	15610	5250	-10,360

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 67

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

Having been duly ~~sworn~~, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmac
~~Att~~ Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property MV	28650	5250	-23,400
Totals	28650	5250	-23,400

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 48

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

Having been duly ~~sworn~~, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmoc
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	810	350	-460
Totals	810	350	-460

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 69

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

Having been duly ~~sworn~~, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmac
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay Recused

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
~~Personal Property~~	MV	5050	750	-4300
Totals		5050	750	-4300

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 70

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

Having been duly ~~sworn~~, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmoc
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay Recused

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
~~Personal Property~~	MV	810	350	-460
Totals		810	350	-460

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 71

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

Having been duly ~~sworn~~, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmoc
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous ____

Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay	Recused

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
Personal Property	MV	9170	350	-8820
Totals		9170	350	-8820

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 72

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmac
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	15660	350	-15,310
Totals	15660	350	-15,310

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 73

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmoc
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay RECUSED

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
~~Personal Property~~	MV	20160	350	-19,810
Totals		20160	350	-19,810

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 74

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

Having been duly ~~sworn~~, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmoc
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay RECUSED

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
~~Personal Property~~	MV	28650	5250	-23,400
Totals		28650	5250	-23,400

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 75

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

Having been duly ~~sworn~~, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: OWEN Jarmac
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay RECUSED

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
~~Personal Property~~	MV	45,080	20,000	-25,080
Totals		45,080	20,000	-25,080

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 76

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Owen Jarmac
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	31720	7500	-24,220
Totals	31720	7500	-24,220

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 77

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

Having been duly ~~sworn~~, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: OWEN Jarmac
Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay RECUSED

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
~~Personal Property~~	MV	22240	7500	-14,740
Totals		22240	7500	-14,740

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 78

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmac Tobacco, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	3780	350	-3430
Totals	3780	350	-3430

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 79

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	9440	350	-9090
Totals	9440	350	-9090

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 80

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	4910	350	4560
Totals	4910	350	4560

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 81

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmac Tobacco, Owen Jarmac., Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	9700	350	9350
Totals	9700	350	9350

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 82

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	8730	350	-8380
Totals	8730	350	-8380

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 83

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay	____ Nay RECUSED

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
~~Personal Property~~	MV	8820	Exempt	-8820
Totals		8820	-0-	-8820

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 84

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	7420	Exempt	-7420
Totals	7420	-0-	-7420

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 85

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmac Tobacco, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	4710	350	-4360
Totals	4710	350	-4360

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 86

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmac Tobacco, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	15,440	Exempt	-15440
Totals	15,440	-0-	-15440

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 87

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	13720	350	-13370
Totals	13720	350	-13370

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 88

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	12600	Exempt	-12600
Totals	12600	-0-	-12,600

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 89

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmac Tobacco, Owen Jarmac., Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	21640	Exempt	-21640
Totals	21640	-0-	-21640

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 90

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	15330	750	-14580
Totals	15330	750	-14580

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 91

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmac Tobacco, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	12150	Exempt	-12,150
Totals	12150	0	-12,150

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 92

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay RECUSED

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	10750	Exempt	-10,750
Totals	10750	- 0 -	-10,750

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 93

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	13860	350	-13510
Totals	13860	350	-13510

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 94

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	Yay	Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	8440	350	-8090
Totals	8440	350	-8090

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 95

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	12440	350	-12,090
Totals	12440	350	-12,090

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 96

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmac Tobacco, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	9370	350	-9020
Totals	9370	350	-9020

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 97

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmac Tobacco, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	8330	350	-7980
Totals	8330	350	-7980

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 98

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmac Tobacco, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
~~Personal Property~~	MV	10060	700	-9360
Totals		10,060	700	-9360

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 99

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmac Tobacco, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	4620	350	-4270
Totals	4620	350	-4270

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 100

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay	____ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~/MV	13560	Exempt	-13560
Totals	13560	-0-	-13560

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 101

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay	
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay	Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	9350	EXEMPT	-9350
Totals	9350	0	-9350

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 102

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	1390	350	-1040
Totals	1390	350	-1040

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 103

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	11260	350	-10910
Totals	11260	350	-10910

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 104

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori ~~Longhi and~~ seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	5290	350	-4940
Totals	5290	350	-4940

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 105

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco, Owen Jarmoc, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	14160	Exempt	-14160
Totals	14160	0	-14160

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 106

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmac Tobacco, Owen Jarmac, Att Derek Donnelly

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	14160	Exempt	-14160
Totals	14160	-0-	-14160

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 107

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet

Property Type & Location: MV **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
~~Personal Property~~	MV	19850	13,580	-6270
Totals		19850	13,580	-6270

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 108

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
~~Personal Property~~	MV	8970	6279	-2691
Totals		8970	6279	-2691

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 109

Decision Date: _____

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
~~Personal Property~~	MV	10,120	6,913	-3207
Totals		10,120	6913	-3207

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 110

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
~~Personal Property~~	MV	54780	14,350	-40,430
Totals		54,780	14,350	-40,430

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 111

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	45,750	15,555	-30,195
Totals	45,750	15 555	-30,195

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 112

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	33,660	26,568	-7092
Totals	33660	26568	-7092

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 113

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
~~Personal Property~~	MV	10,120	6913	-3207
Totals		10,120	6913	-3207

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 114

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet – Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property MV	130,820	75,290	-55,530
Totals	130,820	75,290	-55,530

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 115

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
~~Personal Property~~	MV	69,420	36,080	-33,340
Totals		69,420	36,080	-33,340

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 116 + 117

Decision Date: _____

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

Appeals 116 + 117 Withdraw appeal - Exempt MV

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	_____	_____	_____
Totals	_____	_____	_____

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 118

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
~~Personal Property~~	MV	12110	7280	-4830
Totals		12110	7280	-4830

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 119

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
Personal Property	MV	17 300	7,280	-5550
Totals		17,300	7280	-5550

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 120

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
Personal Property	MV	26050	13287	-12,763
Totals		26050	13287	-12,763

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 121

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet – Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
Personal Property	MV	16,910	10,660	-6250
Totals		16,910	10,660	-6250

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 122

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal~~ Property MV	41,190	24,234	-16,956
Totals	41,190	24,234	-16,956

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 123

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	18 900	12 435	-6465
Totals	18 900	12 435	-6465

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 124

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	27060	8,425	-18635
Totals	27060	8,425	-18,635

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 125

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	8,190	4225	-3965
Totals	8,190	4225	-3965

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 126

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	8190	4225	-3965
Totals	8190	4225	-3965

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 127

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	7560	4045	-3515
Totals	7560	4045	-3515

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 128

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	36,200	16,835	-19,365
Totals	36,200	16,835	-19,365

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 129

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Gradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	17,870	11,300	-6570
Totals	17,870	11,300	-6570

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 130

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Fradet - Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	11,990	3875	-8115
Totals	11,990	3875	-8115

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 131

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kelly Gradet - Duane Sandero

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	17300	3555	-13,745
Totals	17300	3555	-13,745

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 132

Decision Date: _____

Property Owner/Agent: Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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

Withdrew this appeal

_____ 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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	_____	_____	_____
Totals	_____	_____	_____

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 133

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: M.V. **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	2520.00	500.00	-2020.00
Totals	2520.00	500.00	-2020.00

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 134

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	350.00	70.00	-245.00
Totals	350.00	70.00	-245.00

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 135

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Duane Sanders

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	6410.00	$4550.00	-1860
Totals	6410.	4550	-1860

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 136

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Duane Saunders

Property Type & Location: trailer - MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	1250	455	-795
Totals	1250	455	-795

2024 Decision Board of Assessment Appeals **Appeal #** 137
Grand List October 1, 2023 **Decision Date:** 3-28-24

After due consideration and thoughtful deliberation of all evidence in the matter of this appeal, Enfield's Board of Assessment Appeals finds that the Property Owner Jarmoc Farms

✓ 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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski
THEREFORE, THIS APPLICATION WAS GRANTED/DENIED by VOTE as follows:

Unanimous

Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay	____ Nay RECUSED

Farm Land	Code	River Valley	Acres	Amount	Appraised Amount	Assessed Amount
Tillable A	710	2,530				
Tillable B	711	1,810	.28	507	2500	350
Tillable C	712	1,690				
Tillable D	713	1,170				
Orchard E	714	990				
Pasture F	715	280				
Swamp, Ledge	716	40				
Scrub G	716	40				
Woodland/Forest	717/610	390				
Open Space	718	1,690				
OTHER RELIEF ORDERED: This property be restored and reinstated to its prior P.A. 490 Status and classification(s) as existed on the 10-1-2020 Grand List with exception(s) only for the above assessment calculation(s) immediately.						
	TOTALS					

No Lot or imputed lot value - Farmed in front of RR tracks

	APPRAISED AMOUNT	10/1/2023 ASSESSMENT	10/1/2022 Assessment	10/1/2021 Assessment
Land	2500	350		
Buildings				
Out Buildings				
Personal Property				
	2500	350		

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 138

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: David Longhi

Property Type & Location: 1427 Enfield St. **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay	
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay	~~Recused~~ 2-0-1 Vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay ____ Nay	

Appeal form Farm Land & Vicki's H's land all together

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
	2023 - 46 card -			
63,090	Land	53,100	43,932	-9,168
225,300	Building	225,300	208,802	-16,498
18,300	Out Buildings	18,300	18,200	-100
	~~Personal Property~~ Farm Land	9,990	6622	-3,368
306,690	Totals	306,690	277,556	-29,134

PA490 - Correct Street Card - Retribution - last 3 years

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 139

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Lily's LLC David Longhi

Property Type ~~& Location~~: 49 Park 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: _____

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous				
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay		
Lori Longhi	___ Yay	___ Nay	✓ Recused	2-0-1 vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay	___ Nay		

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	46,400	28,000	-18,400
Building	100,700	98,000	-2,700
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	147,100	126,000	-21,100

Retribution - last 3 years
correct field card

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 140

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Hollys LLC

Property Type & Location: 1421 Enfield St. 1445 Enf. St., **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous ____

Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	___ Yay	___ Nay	✓ Recused 2-0-1 vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay	___ Nay	

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	51,900	42,880	-9,020
Building	170,100	138,540	-31,560
Out Buildings	12,000	11,780	-220
Personal Property			
Totals	234,000	193,200	-40,800

Retribution - last 3 years

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 141

Decision Date: 328-24

Property Owner/Agent: David Longhi

Property Type & Location: 28 Post office 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: David Longhi

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay	✓ Recused
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay ___ Nay	

2-0-1 vote

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ Farm	570	570	-0
Totals	570	570	-0-

Street card needs to be changed

Retributions

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 142

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Thompsonville Moose Club

Property Type & Location: 124 South 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: William Cutter & Ken Kaufman

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	79,900	-0-	-79,900
Building	291,200	-0-	-291,200
Out Buildings	6,000	-0-	-6,000
Personal Property			
Totals	377,100	-0-	-377,100

If any personal property - They're EXEMPT from that also.

Please correct Field Card

Retribution - 30d year -

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 143

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Carl Randolonia

Property Type & Location: 15 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: Tim Kearcher

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	111400	111,400	-0-
Building	491600	491,600	-0-
Out Buildings	185600	42,910	-142,690
Personal Property			
Totals	788,600	645,910	-142,690

Retribution –

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 145

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Carl Landolina

Property Type & Location: 555 Taylor 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: Tim Kearcher

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	1736410	122,835	-1,613,575
Totals	1,736,410	122,835	-1,613,575

Retribution

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 146

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Gilbert Vasseur

Property Type & Location: Broad Brook Rd Map 103, Lot 53, **Enfield, CT**

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

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

X 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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	244070	39,600	-204470
Building	117800	98,784	-19016
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ Farm Land PA490		12440	+12440
Totals	361870	150824	-211046

UPDATE FIELD CARD, Retrobution

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 147

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Peter Sarno Letter Press Art

Property Type & Location: 13 Rockland P.P. **, Enfield, CT**

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: No Show

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay _1_ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	6570	6570	-0-
Totals	6570	6570	-0-

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 148

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Raymond Romano

Property Type & Location: 54 Virginia 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: _____

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	142,700	5,280	-137,420
Building			
Out Buildings	8200	8240	40
Personal Property			
Totals	150,900	13,520	-137,380

Correct PA 490 Status on field card

Return to previous year

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 149

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Muddy Foot Farm, Charlie Mastroberti

Property Type & Location: 50 Weymouth 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: Charles Mastroberti

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	148,900	62,740	-86,160
Building	112,400	-0-	-112,400
Out Buildings	5,100	56,420	+51,320
~~Personal Property~~ Farm Land		2947	+ 2,947
Totals	266,400	122,107	-144,293

UPDATE FIELD CARD REPEATED RETROBUTION

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 150

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Michael Wilczak

Property Type & Location: 95 Middle Road **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	44,600	44,600	0
Building	76,300	76,300	0
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	120,900	120,900	0

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 151

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Penny & Vincent Urbanowicz

Property Type & Location: 25 South 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: Andrew Urbanowicz

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay ✓ Recused

2-0-1 Vote

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	45,400	43,930	-1,470
Building	50,300	50,250	-50
Out Buildings	7,000	7,000	-0-
~~Personal Property~~ PA 490 Farm Land		1,870	1870
Totals	102,700	103,050	+350

PA490 to be restored

* Assessor Failed to reclassify the field card. Please Correct the field card

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 152

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: B & B Produce, LLC

Property Type & Location: 467 Taylor 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: Andrew Urbanowicz

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay	___ Nay ✓ Recused

2-0-1 vote

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	4,160	-0-	-4,160
Totals	4,160	-0-	-4,160

Retribution — No Business in Enfield Has no personal property

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 153

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Matthew + Laurie Stifel

Property Type & Location: 79 Cottage Road, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	60,300	60,300	0
Building	124,200	106,780	-17,420
Out Buildings	4700	4700	0
Personal Property			
Totals	189,200	171,780	-17,420

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 154

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay	✓ Recused
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay ___ Nay	

2-0-1 Vote

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	29,960	24,746	-5,214
Totals	29,960	24,746	-5,214

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 155

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay	
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay	✓Recused 2-0-1 vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay ____ Nay	

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	32,600	17,672	-14,928
Totals	32,600	17,672	-14,928

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 156

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	___ Yay	___ Nay	✓ Recused
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay	___ Nay	

2-0-1 vote

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	35,350	17,587	-17,763
Totals	35,350	17,587	-17,763

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 157

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous			
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	___ Yay	___ Nay	✓ Recused
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay	___ Nay	

2-0-1 Vote

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ PV	48,000	23,005	-24,995
Totals	48,000	23,005	-24,995

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 158

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	___ Yay	___ Nay	~~✓~~ Recused
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay	___ Nay	

2 - 0 - 1 vote

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	35,350	17,587	-17,763
Totals	35,350	17,587	-17,763

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 159

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	___ Yay	___ Nay	✓ Recused
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay	___ Nay	

2-0-1 vote

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	11,590	2,595	-8,995
Totals	11,590	2,595	-8,995

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 160

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous			
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay		
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay	✓ Recused	2-0-1 Vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay ___ Nay		

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	22,960	16,433	-6,527
Totals	23,960	16,433	-6,527

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 161

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous			
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay		
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay	✓ Recused	2-0-1 vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay ____ Nay		

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	18,940	1,996	-16,944
Totals	18,940	1,996	-16,944

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 162

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓		
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay		
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay	✓ Recused	2-0-1 vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay ___ Nay		

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	19,950	11,700	-8,250
Totals	19,950	11,700	-8,250

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 163

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓		
Donna Dubanoski	__ Yay	__ Nay	
Lori Longhi	__ Yay	__ Nay	✓ Recused
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay	__ Nay	

2-0-1 vote

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	30,380	21,460	-8,920
Totals	30,380	21,460	-8,920

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 164

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	___ Yay	___ Nay	✓ Recused 2-0-1 vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay	___ Nay	

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	39,710	28,700	-11,010
Totals	39,710	28,700	-11,010

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 165

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous			
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay		
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay	✓ Recused	2-0-1 vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay ___ Nay		

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	41,700	32,200	-9,500
Totals	41,700	32,200	-9,500

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 166

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	___ Yay	___ Nay	Recused 2-0-1 vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay	___ Nay	

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	12,740	9,820	-2,920
Totals	12,740	9,820	-2,920

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 167

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	___ Yay	___ Nay	✓ Recused
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay	___ Nay	

2-0-1 vote

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	18,130	5,152	-12,978
Totals	18,130	5,152	-12,978

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 168

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous			
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay		
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay	✓ Recused	2-0-1 vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay ___ Nay		

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	41,060	21,970	-19,090
Totals	41,060	21,970	-19,090

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 169

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous ___

Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	___ Yay	___ Nay	✓ Recused
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay	___ Nay	

2-0-1 Vote

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	12,820	3,764	-9,056
Totals	12,820	3,764	-9,056

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 170

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay	___ Nay	✓ - Recused
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay	___ Nay	

2-0-1 vote

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	11,150	7,348	-3,802
Totals	11,150	7,348	-3,802

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 171

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous				
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay		
Lori Longhi	___ Yay	___ Nay	✓ Recused	2-0-1
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay	___ Nay		Vote

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	14,860	8,230	-6,530
Totals	14,860	8,230	-6,530

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 172

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous			
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay		
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay	✓ Recused	2-0-1 vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay ___ Nay		

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	34,420	20,800	-13,620
Totals	34,420	20,800	-13,620

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 173

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous			
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	___ Yay	___ Nay	✓ Recused
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay	___ Nay	

2-0-1 vote

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ mv	44,750	32,578	-12,172
Totals	44,750	32,578	-12,172

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 174

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay		
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay	✓ Recused	2-0-1 vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay ___ Nay		

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ mv	32,920	18,800	-14,120
Totals	32,920	18,800	-14,120

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 175

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	____		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ____ Nay		
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay	✓ Recused	2-0-1 Vote
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay ____ Nay		

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	15,280	10,497	-4,783
Totals	15,280	10,497	-4,783

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 176

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: Spazzarini Construction

Property Type & Location: 38 Post Office 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: Mark Spazzarini

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 Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous			
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay	___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	___ Yay	___ Nay	~~-~~ Recused
Andrew Urbanowicz	✓ Yay	___ Nay	

2-0-1 vote

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ mv	2,560	1,000	-1,560
Totals	2,560	1,000	-1,560

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 177

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Tire country of Enfield

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: Kenneth Brennan, Att. Derek Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	35,830	7750	-28,080
Totals	35,830	7750	-28,080

Repeated Retribution

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 178

Decision Date: Withdrawn

Property Owner/Agent: BOC Enterpreses

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

"Withdraw this appeal"

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	_____	_____	_____
Totals	_____	_____	_____

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 179

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: BOC Enterprises, Travis LaPlante

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
Personal Property	MV	28,110	11200	-16,910
Totals		28,110	11200	-16,910

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 180

Decision Date: _____

Property Owner/Agent: Maple Valley Industries Travis LaPlante

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

		Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land				
Building				
Out Buildings				
Personal Property	MV	8260	3500	-4760
Totals		8260	3500	-4760

No Show

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 181

Decision Date: 3

Property Owner/Agent: Fifth Third Bank

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 attend

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

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

Motion to approve appeal made by Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	1,757,790	1,757,790	0
Totals	1,757,790	1,757,790	0

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 182

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Hazardville Water Co.

Property Type & Location: 7 Kimberly 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: Robert Sherwood

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	37,900	2,220	-35,680
Building	16,200	-0-	-16,200
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	54,100	2,220	-51,880

Return to previous year—
Retribution 3rd year

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 183

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Hazardville Water Co.

Property Type & Location: 8 Grant 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: Robert Sherwood

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	29,500	1,800	-27,700
Building			
Out Buildings	16,200	0	-16,200
Personal Property			
Totals	45,700	1,800	-43,900

Return to previous year
Retribution - 3rd year

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 184

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Hazardville Water Co.

Property Type & Location: 25 South Maple St., **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	28,100	1,420	-26,680
Building			
Out Buildings	27,100	-0-	-27,100
Personal Property			
Totals	55,200	1,420	-53,780

Return to previous year
Retribution - 3rd year

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 185

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: BAE Enterprises LLC

Property Type & Location: 275 Brainard 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: William Guzie

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	54,500	28,000	-26,500
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	54,500	28,000	-26,500

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 186

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Guzie Farm & Nursery

Property Type & Location: 44 Long Hollow 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: Bill Guzie

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	70,900	59,010	-11,890
Building	135,900	135,900	-0-
Out Buildings	4,300	4,300	-0-
Personal Property			
Totals	211,100	199,210	-11,890

Retribution

Return to previous year
Correct Gold Card

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 187

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Guzie Farm & Nursery

Property Type & Location: 44 Long Hollow 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: Bill Guzie

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	71,100	1,820	-69,280
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	71,100	1,820	-69,280

Retribution
correct Field card

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 188

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Brainard Road, LLC

Property Type & Location: 275 Brainard 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: Bill Ouzel

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	8,600	1,000	-7,600
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	8,600	1,000	-7,600

Retribution

Correct Field Card

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 189

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Brainard Rd LLC

Property Type & Location: 275 Brainard 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: Bill Organ

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	107,800	62,670	-45,130
Building	81,200	81,190	-10
Out Buildings	6,400	6,400	-0-
Personal Property			
Totals	195,400	150,260	-45,140

Retribution -

Correct Field Card

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 190

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Guzie Farm

Property Type & Location: 46 Long Hollow 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: Bill Guzie

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	67,300	1,270	-66,030
Building			
Out Buildings	3,400	3,400	-0-
Personal Property			
Totals	70,700	4,470	-66,030

Retribution - correct Field card

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 191

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: S. Camerota & Sons, Inc. Camerota Truck Parts

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: James K. Arcouette

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	396,680	203,380	-193,300
Totals	396,680	203,380	-193,300

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 192

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: S. Camerota & Sons Inc. Camerota Truck Parts

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: James K. Arcouette, CPA

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	1,051,300	712,280	-339,020
Totals	1,051,300	712,280	-339,020

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 193

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: S. Camerota & Sons, Inc. Camerota Truck Parts

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: _____

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	307,750	181,950	-125,800
Totals	307,750	181,950	-125,800

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 194

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Deborah L. Young

Property Type & Location: 14 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: Deborah L. Young

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	46,800	46,400	-400
Building	101,900	91,800	-10,100
Out Buildings	400	400	0
Personal Property			
Totals	149,100	138,600	-10,500

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 195

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: P.T.M. Realty LLC

Property Type & Location: 5 Peerless Way **, Enfield, CT**

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

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

X 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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	188,860	167,120	-21,740
Building	757,200	757,200	0
Out Buildings	13,000	13,000	0
Personal Property			
Totals	959 060	937,320	-21,740

* BAA Heard Evidence of repeated retribution by town against Walter Kruzel and P.T.M. Realty LLC.

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 196

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Gary H. Young

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ Motor Vehicle	4380	560	-3820
Totals	4380	560	-3820

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 197

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: General Electric Company

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 attend

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	86,280	86,280	0
Totals	86,280	86,280	0

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 198

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Transportation

Property Type & Location: 128 Moody, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay	2-0-1 Vote
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay	Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	43,430	1,050	-42,380
Totals	43,430	1,050	-42,380

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 199

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Transportation

Property Type & Location: 128 Moody 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: OJ
Att. Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay	2-0-1 Vote
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay	Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	14,630	2100	-12,530
Totals	14,630	2100	-12,530

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 200

Decision Date: 3/28/24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Transportation

Property Type & Location: 128 Moody 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: OJ
Att. Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay	2-0-1 vote
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay	Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	14,780	1400	-13,380
Totals	14,780	1400	-13,382

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 201

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Trasportation

Property Type & Location: 128 Moody 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: Owen Jarmoc
Att. Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay	2-0-1 vote
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay	Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ mv	33,640	1,750	-31,890
Totals	33,640	1,750	-31,890

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 202

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Patrick Martin

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	19460	14910	-4550
Totals	19460	14910	-4550

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 203

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Farms

Property Type & Location: 128 Moody 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: Owen Jarmoc
Att. Donnelly

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓	
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay	2-0-1 vote
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay	Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	4690	350	-4340
Totals	4,690	350	-4,340

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 2024

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: A & O Roe 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: Oliver Roe

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

✓

Unanimous	_____
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	1520	0	-1520
Totals	1520	0	-1520

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 205

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Enfield Hunters Club - Ed Krzanowski

Property Type & Location: 258 Post Office 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: Ed Krzanowski

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	75,730	25,650	-50,080
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	75,730	25,650	-50,080

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 206

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Enfield Hunters Club Edward Krzanowski

Property Type & Location: 2 Post Office 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: Ed

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	44,620	15,120	-29,500
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	44,620	15,120	-29,500

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 207

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Enfield Hunters Club - Ed Krzanowski

Property Type & Location: 41 Celtic Court **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	40,790	13820	-26,970
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	40,790	13820	-26,970

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 208

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Enfield Hunters Club - Ed Krzanowski

Property Type & Location: 39 Simon Road **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	2050	700	-1350
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	2050	700	-1350

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 209

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Gerald Leblanc

Property Type & Location: P.P. - Old truck, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	14010	1080	-12,930
Totals	14010	1080	-12,930

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 210

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Edward McGuire

Property Type & Location: 77 Moody Road, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous		
Donna Dubanoski	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	✓ Yay ___ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay	Recused

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	106,010	72,530	-33,480
Building	101,000	101,000	-0-
Out Buildings	16,900	16,900	-0-
Personal Property			
Totals	223,910	190,430	-33,480

41.696 acres Correct Field Card to reflect proper acerage as on the filed A-2 Survey (41 ac FARM Land . 696 ac house Lot #26,446)

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 211

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Edward Shirley

Property Type & Location: 12 Missile 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: Ed Shirley

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	56,600	56,600	-0-
Building	108,600	108,400	-0-
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	165,200	165,000	-200

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 212

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Sean Grady Control Module

Property Type & Location: 89 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: Sean Grady

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	95,800	-0-	-95,800
Totals	95,800	-0-	-95,800

EXempt manufacturing

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 213

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Joshua Marquez / Joshua Marquez Photography

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: Amanda Marquez

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	4890	0	-4890
Totals	4890	0	-4890

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 214

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kogut Nursery LLC Brian Kogut

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	5050	350	-4700
Totals	5050	350	-4700

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 215

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kogut Nursery Brian Kogut

Property Type & Location: MV - trailer **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	5050	350	-4700
Totals	5050	350	-4700

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 216

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kogut Nursery LLC Brian Kogut

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	8190	1400	-6790
Totals	8190	1400	-6790

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 217

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kogut Nursery LLC. Brian Kogut

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	490	1050	+385
Totals	490	1050	+385

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 218

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kogut Nursery, Brian Kogut

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	3290	350	-2940
Totals	3290	350	-2940

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 219

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kogut Nursery LLC Brian Kogut

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	11,150	2800.00	-8350
Totals	11,150	2800.00	-8350

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 220

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Kogut Nursery LLC, Brian Kogut

Property Type & Location: MV **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ MV	5990	1225	-4765
Totals	5990	1225	-4765

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 221

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: FRW Maintenance Corp Brian Koguit

Property Type & Location: 76 Park 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: Brian

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	74,710	55,310	-19400
Building	70,000	42,700	-27300
Out Buildings	47,800	14,135	-33,665
Personal Property			
Totals	192,510	112,145	-80,365

Repeated Retribution added a bathroom to this property that is not there. Changed his FEP to Living space. An inspection was done last year on this house. Update field card.

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 222

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: FRW Maintenance Corp Brian Kogut

Property Type & Location: 91 North 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: Brian Kogut

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	94,000	94,000	-0-
Building	97,000	78,800	-18,200
Out Buildings	72,100	72,100	-0-
Personal Property			
Totals	263,100	244,900	-18,200

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 223

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: FRW Maintenance Brian Kogut

Property Type & Location: 96 North St **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓	
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay	
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay	

* BAA Heard evidence of Repeated Retribution by town,

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	77,640	8,825	-68,815
Building	40,300	-0-	-40,300
Out Buildings		8,800	+ 8,800
Personal Property			
Totals	117,940	17,625	-100,315

* A site visit was requested by the appelant in prior years. I myself went to this building took pictures and submitted them as proof it was an outbuilding with NO utilities. this property is just another example of repeated retribution by the town against Kogut and entities. Field card needs to be updated to reflect BAA decisions. JL

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 224

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: William Gordon & Karen Gordon

Property Type & Location: 484 Hazard Avenue **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	49,000	19,600	-29,400
Building	100,900	100,900	0
Out Buildings	200	200	0
Personal Property			
Totals	150,100	120,700	-29,400

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 225

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: William Gordon

Property Type & Location: Motor Vehicle **, Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
~~Personal Property~~ M/V	10,850	10,850	0
Totals	10,850	10,850	0

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 226

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Yamaha Motor Finance

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: NONE - NO Show

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	94080	94080	-0-
Totals	94080	94080	-0-

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 227

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: Jamison P. Burnside

Property Type & Location: 27 Litchfield Drive, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	56,600	56,600	0
Building	158,600	152,400	-6,200
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	215,200	209,000	-6200

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 228

Decision Date: 3/28/2024

Property Owner/Agent: James + Ann Piekos

Property Type & Location: 3 Valley View Circle, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	63,300	63,300	0
Building	136,200	136,200	0
Out Buildings	22,700	14,900	-7800
Personal Property			
Totals	222,200	214,400	-7800

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 229

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Anthony Bellafronte

Property Type & Location: PP 3-11-24, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	59,560	18,600	-50,960
Totals	59,560	18,600	-50,960

repeated retribution of removing exemption

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 230

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Maria Chavez Carmesas Bakery

Property Type & Location: 95 High St, **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	24,050	10,000	-14,050
Totals	24,050	10,000	-14,050

- Declaration Attached to original Correct Personal Property

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 231

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Maria Chavez Sarapes

Property Type & Location: 95 High St. **Enfield, CT**

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

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	138,350	20,000	-118,350
Totals	138,350	20,000	-118,350

Correct the personal property Declaration attached to original

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 232

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: Joel Cox

Property Type & Location: 8 Sandpiper 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: _____

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	3-0
Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	1,250	-0-	-1,250
Totals	1,250	-0-	-1,250

See Attached email → Vicki Rose
to original
Heidi Tucker-Dillon
Joel Cox

— No Business —

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 233

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: AT+T Mobility 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: No Show - Must deny

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	34,440		
Totals	34,440		

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 234

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: AT+T Mobility 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: No Show - Must deny

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	47420		
Totals	47420		

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 235

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: AT+T Mobility 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: No Show - Must deny

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	521,600		
Totals	521,600		

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: _____

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: AT+T Mobility 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: No Show - Must deny

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	82,890		
Totals	82 890		

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 237

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: AT+T Mobility 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: No Show - Must deny

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	92,640		
Totals	92,640		

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 238

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: AT+T Mobility 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: No Show - Must deny

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	18,220		
Totals	18,220		

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 239

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: AT+T Mobility 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: No Show - Must deny

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	85,140		
Totals	85,140		

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 240

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: AT+T Mobility 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: No Show - Must deny

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	106,860		
Totals	106,860		

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 241

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: AT+T Mobility 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: No Show - Must deny

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	72,330		
Totals	72,330		

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 242

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: AT+T Mobility 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: No Show - Must deny

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	150 030		
Totals	150 030		

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 243

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: AT+T Mobility 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: No Show - Must deny

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	28 250		
Totals	28 250		

2024 DECISION MINUTES
Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 244

Decision Date: 3-28-24

Property Owner/Agent: AT+T Mobility 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: No Show - Must deny

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 Lori Longhi and seconded by Donna Dubanoski

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

Unanimous	✓
Donna Dubanoski	____ Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____ Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____ Yay ____ Nay

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	8140		
Totals	8140		

Evidence of Retribution by Town against Appellants Lists

Grand List October 1, 2023

Appeal #	Name
148	Romano
132-136	Saunders
149	Muddy Foot Farm
146	Vassuer
151	Urbanowicz
214-223	Kougut
26 & 27	DeLorge
142	Loyal Order of the Moose 1525
185-190	Guzie
56,57 & 58	Lindeland
143 & 145	Kearcher
107-131	Kelly Fradet
138-141	Longhi
19	Mullen
182-184	Hazardville Water Co.
229	Collins
10 & 11	Enfield Loaves and Fishes
195	PTM Realty
205-208	Hunters Club
152	B & B Produce
177	Tire Country
16	Foss
24	Szczesiul
28-54 & 59-106	Jarmoc