

RECEIVED
ENFIELD TOWN CLERK

Unapproved Minutes

BAA Deliberations Meeting 2025 MAY -2 PM 12: 25

April 24, 2025 1:00pm

Sheila M Bailey

Roll Call: Lori Longhi, Chairman Andrew Urbanowicz, Vice Chairman Daniel DeGray, Recording Secretary

The board deliberated and made decisions on all 10/1/2024 Grand List Assessments Heard during the month of April 2025. Following deliberations, a motion to Grant each appeal was made by Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray and voted upon by all three members.

BAA NOTE: There were some exceptions when Andrew Urbanowicz recused himself, he was absent for and did not participate in either deliberations or decision making. In such recusal instance the motion to Grant was made by Daniel DeGray and seconded by Lori Longhi and then voted on by Daniel De Gray and Lori Longhi.

Whenever applicable, said recusal by Andrew Urbanowicz is clearly identified on the Decision Minutes.

The BAA heard evidence of retribution and repeated retribution by the town against Appellants though it much less than prior years.

The BAA will ask for a legal opinion on the appellants that have had repeated reversals and the town assessor is in agreement with this request.

The BAA has encountered a new problem that was identified with the prior Assessor Todd Helems. The BAA received testimony and received evidence that he closed residents open permits and then assessed these open permits as the work being fully completed. Apparently this was done without ever checking to see why the permits were not closed out or if the open permits ever got any inspections or were even partially completed by the building department. In this particular hearing the citizen paid taxes for three years on renovations that were never completed in her home. When this was brought to the current assessor staff, Assistant Assessor Tyler Devine promptly went out to the residents house and then corrected this field card from October 1, 2024 forward. This property will be corrected going forward however the BAA doesn't have the ability to go back farther than October 1, 2024 unless it was a "clerical error" and in this case it was not a clerical error. The BAA is sad to report that they have no remedy to fix this for the prior years that this resident had been *incorrectly* paying additional tax money.

Motion was made by the Chairman Longhi and seconded by Vice Chair Urbanowicz to adjourn the Meeting at 3:10pm motion unanimously passed.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel DeGray

BAA Recording Secretary

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 1

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Susan Byczko

Property Type & Location: 35 Lynch Terrace, 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 show up for hearing

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

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

OR

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

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

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

	Unanimous	
<u>Daniel DeGray</u>	☒	
Donna Dubanoski	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>42,400</u>	<u>42,400</u>	<u>0</u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>42,400</u>	<u>42,400</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 2

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Kara Torres / Kara Beebe

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 show up for hearing

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

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

OR

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

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

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

	Unanimous
<u>Daniel DeGray</u>	<u>✓</u>
<u>Donna Dubanoski</u>	<u> </u>
<u>Lori Longhi</u>	<u> </u>
<u>Andrew Urbanowicz</u>	<u> </u>

<u> </u>	Yay	<u> </u>	Nay
<u> </u>	Yay	<u> </u>	Nay
<u> </u>	Yay	<u> </u>	Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>1360</u>	<u>1360</u>	<u>- 0 -</u>
Totals	<u>1360</u>	<u>1360</u>	<u>- 0 -</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 3

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Gerald Leblanc

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: G. L.

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

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

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

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

	Unanimous	
<u>Daniel DeGray</u>	☒	
~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☐	Yay ___ Nay ___
Lori Longhi	☐	Yay ___ Nay ___
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐	Yay ___ Nay ___

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>14,710</u>	<u>5.00</u>	<u>-14,705</u>
Totals	<u>14,710</u>	<u>5.00</u>	<u>-14,705</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 4

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: John Tittarelli/NCC 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: JT

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

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

OR

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

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

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

	Unanimous	☒
Daniel DeGray	~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
	Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
	Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>12,700</u>	<u>3,933</u>	<u>-8,767</u>
Totals	<u>12,700</u>	<u>3,933</u>	<u>-8,767</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 5

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Debra Colli

Property Type & Location: 20 Coolidge 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: D.C.

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

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

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

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

	Unanimous	
<u>Daniel DeGray</u>	☒	
~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☐	Yay ___ Nay
Lori Longhi	☐	Yay ___ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐	Yay ___ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>62 700</u>	<u>38,500</u>	<u>-24200</u>
Building	<u>185 200</u>	<u>182 000</u>	<u>- 3 200</u>
Out Buildings	<u>2000</u>	<u>2 000</u>	<u>0</u>
Personal Property	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
Totals	<u>249 900</u>	<u>222500</u>	<u>- 27400</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 6

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Gilbert Vasseur Jr & Janice Vasseur

Property Type & Location: Still Lane, Enfield, CT

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

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 Daniel DeGray and seconded by Lori Longhi

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

☒ Yay ☐ Nay

☒ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay **RECUSED**

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>68700</u>	<u>8000</u>	<u>-60,700</u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>68700</u>	<u>8000</u>	<u>-60,700</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 7

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Stephen Hall Trustee

Property Type & Location: 21 Misty Meadow, Enfield, CT

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

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

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

OR

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

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

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

	Unanimous	
<u>Daniel DeGray</u>	☒	
~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☐	Yay ___ Nay ___
Lori Longhi	☐	Yay ___ Nay ___
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐	Yay ___ Nay ___

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>67,100</u>	<u>67,100</u>	<u>0</u>
Building	<u>162,300</u>	<u>57,975</u>	<u>-104,325</u>
Out Buildings	<u>2,700</u>	<u>2,700</u>	<u>0</u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>232,100</u>	<u>127,775</u>	<u>-104,325</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 8

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Sargent Farms

Property Type & Location: 25 Birchwood 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: Mark & Carol Sargent

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

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

OR

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

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

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

	Unanimous	☒
<i>Daniel DeGray</i>	Donna Dubanoski	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
	Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
	Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>79200</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>-77,200</u>
Building	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
Out Buildings	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
Personal Property	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
Totals	<u>79200</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>-77,200</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 9

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Heather Stewart

Property Type & Location: MV - Exempt, Enfield, CT

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

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

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

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

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

	Unanimous
<u>Daniel DeGray</u>	☒ Yay ☐ Nay
<u>Donna Dubanoski</u>	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
<u>Lori Longhi</u>	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
<u>Andrew Urbanowicz</u>	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>2420</u>	<u>Exempt</u>	<u>- 2420</u>
Totals	<u>2420</u>	<u>Exempt</u>	<u>- 2420</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 10

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Frances Berry

Property Type & Location: PP, Enfield, CT

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

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

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

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

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

	Unanimous	
~~Daniel DeGray~~	☒	
Donna Dubanoski	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	<u>1250</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>-1245</u>
Totals	<u>1250</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>-1245</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 11

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Art Mullen

Property Type & Location: PP, 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 Daniel DeGray

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

	Unanimous	☒
<u>Daniel DeGray</u>	~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
	Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
	Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property ~~Exempt~~	<u>3680</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>3670</u>
Totals	<u>3680</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>3670</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 12

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Art Mullen

Property Type & Location: 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: A.M.

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

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

OR

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

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

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

Unanimous

Donna Dubanoski

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

☒ Yay ☐ Nay
☐ Yay ☐ Nay
☐ Yay ☐ Nay

Land

Building

Out Buildings

Personal Property PA490

Totals

Old Assessment

New Assessment

Difference

5300

5300

0

5300

5300

0

Don't have prior Farm File
what dollar amt is OK
but should be enrolled
in PA 490
prior BAA
DECISIONS

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

Appeal # 13
Decision Date: 4/24/2025

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 Mitchell Wójnar

☒ HAS PROVEN beyond a preponderance of evidence the 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
Dan Degray ☒ 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	5.9	9,971	9,971	6980
Tillable D	713	1,170				
Orchard E	714	990				
Pasture F	715	280				
Swamp, Ledge	716	40	.3	12	12	8
Scrub G	716	40				
Woodland/Forest	717/610	390	3	1,170	1,170	819
Open Space	718	1,690				
BL			1	108,200	108,200	75740
* 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			10.2	119,353	119,353	83,547

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land	124,000	83,547	-40,453
Buildings			
Out Buildings	22,500	22,500	0
Personal Property			
Totals:	146,500	106,047	-40,453

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 14

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Ralph Faber

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: R F.

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

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

OR

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

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

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>2910</u>	<u>2910</u>	<u>- 0 -</u>
Totals	<u>2910</u>	<u>2910</u>	<u>- 0 -</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 15

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Stephen Clavette

Property Type & Location: PP, Enfield, CT

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Unanimous	
<u>Daniel DeGray</u>	☒	
<u>Donna Dubanoski</u>	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
<u>Lori Longhi</u>	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
<u>Andrew Urbanowicz</u>	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	<u>9430</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-9430</u>
Totals	<u>9430</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-9430</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 16

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Douglas & Nichole Fuller

Property Type & Location: 153 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: D.F. & N.F.

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

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

OR

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

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

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>51,400</u>	<u>51,400</u>	<u>- 0 -</u>
Building	<u>103,700</u>	<u>37,025</u>	<u>-66,675</u>
Out Buildings	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>157,100</u>	<u>90,425</u>	<u>-66,675</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 17

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Catholic Cemeteries Ass. / Michael Reiner, Esq

Property Type & Location: 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: Acerage is incorrect on exempt parcel
town staff should correct acerage.
No testimony given so must deny on 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>1964300</u>	<u>1964300</u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u>11300</u>	<u>11300</u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>1975600</u>	<u>1975600</u>	<u> </u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 18

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Rudolph Arthofer

Property Type & Location: PP, Enfield, CT

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

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

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

OR

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

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

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>1660</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>-1655</u>
Totals	<u>1660</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>-1655</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 19

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Donald Lango - Enfield St ARCO

Property Type & Location: PP, Enfield, CT

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

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

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

OR

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

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

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

	Unanimous
~~Daniel DeGray~~	~~Yay~~
~~Donna Dubanoski~~	~~Yay~~
~~Lori Longhi~~	~~Yay~~
~~Andrew Urbanowicz~~	~~Yay~~

✓

Yay Nay

Yay Nay

Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	<u>6090</u>	<u>6090</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>6090</u>	<u>6090</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 20

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Shirley Hanlon

Property Type & Location: 7 Gordon 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 Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>46,900</u>	<u>46,900</u>	<u>0</u>
Building	<u>94,500</u>	<u>90,300</u>	<u>- 4,200</u>
Out Buildings	<u>300</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>0</u>
Personal Property			
Totals	<u>141,700</u>	<u>137,500</u>	<u>- 4,200</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 21

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Art Mullen

Property Type & Location: MU, 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 Daniel DeGray

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

	Unanimous	☒
Daniel DeGray	~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
	Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
	Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property- <u>MV</u>	<u>2730</u>	<u>2730</u>	<u>- 0 -</u>
Totals	<u>2730</u>	<u>2730</u>	<u>- 0 -</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 22

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Art Mullen

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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Donna Dubanoski

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

☒ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>2340</u>	<u>2340</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>2340</u>	<u>2340</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 23

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Art Mullen

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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Donna Dubanoski

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

☒ Yay Nay

Yay Nay

Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property- <u>MV</u>	<u>1210</u>	<u>1210</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>1210</u>	<u>1210</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 24

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Robert Sherwood Haz Water

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: _____

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

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

OR

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

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

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>37900</u>	<u>2,220</u>	<u>-35,680</u>
Building	<u>16200</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-16200</u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>54100</u>	<u>2,220</u>	<u>-51,880</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 25

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Haz Water Co Bob Sherwood

Property Type & Location: 8 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: _____

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

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

OR

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

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

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

☒ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>29500</u>	<u>1800</u>	<u>-27700</u>
Building	<u>16200</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-16200</u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>45700</u>	<u>1800</u>	<u>-43900</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 26

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Hazardville Water Bole Sherwood

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: B.S.

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

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

OR

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

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

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray Yay Nay

Lori Longhi Yay Nay

Andrew Urbanowicz Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>28100</u>	<u>1,420</u>	<u>-26680</u>
Building	<u>27100</u>		<u>-27100</u>
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	<u>55,200</u>	<u>1420</u>	<u>-53,780</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 27-1 to 27-8

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Mulch Distributors INC
Kurt Lindeland & Attorney Landolina
Property Type & Location: PP, Enfield, CT

Having been duly (sworn) evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter,
by way of oral testimony from: KL & Att. C. L.

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

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

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

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

	Unanimous	
~~Daniel DeGray~~	☒	
~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>514 060</u>	<u>266 933</u>	<u>-247 127</u>
Totals	<u>514 060</u>	<u>266 933</u>	<u>-247,127</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 28

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Hamlet Homes, LLC

Property Type & Location: 32 Bacon 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: _____

Did not show up for hearing

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

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

OR

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

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

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>175 300</u>	<u>175 300</u>	<u>0</u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>175 300</u>	<u>175 300</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 29

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Darius Roy

Property Type & Location: PP, 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 Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>1090</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>-1085</u>
Totals	<u>1090</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>-1085</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 30

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Zachary Puffer

Property Type & Location: PP, 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 Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>500</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-500</u>
Totals	<u>500</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-500</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 31

Decision Date: 4/24/2025

Property Owner/Agent: PTI Industries / Stephen Wojcik

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: Stephen Wojcik

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

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

OR

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

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

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

	Unanimous
<u>Daniel DeGray</u>	☒ Yay
~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☐ Yay
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>427,460</u>	<u>82,710</u>	<u>-344,750</u>
Totals	<u>427,460</u>	<u>82,710</u>	<u>-344,750</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 32

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: PTI Industries / Stephen Wojcik

Property Type & Location: 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: Stephen Wojcik

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

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

OR

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

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

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

	Unanimous	
~~Daniel DeGray~~	☒	
~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☐	Yay ___ Nay ___
Lori Longhi	☐	Yay ___ Nay ___
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐	Yay ___ Nay ___

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>1,069,790</u>	<u>224,900</u>	<u>-844,890</u>
Totals	<u>1,069,790</u>	<u>224,900</u>	<u>-844,890</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 33

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Transportation, LLC

Property Type & Location: PP, 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, Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>10 460</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-10 460</u>
Totals	<u>10 460</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-10 460</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 34

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Tobacco Owen Jarmoc, Pat Martin

Property Type & Location: PP, 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, PM

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

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

OR

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

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

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

☒
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>85190</u>	<u>Exempt 0</u>	<u>-85190</u>
Totals	<u>85190</u>	<u>Exempt 0</u>	<u>-85190</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 35

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Farms Owen Jarmoc, Pat Martin

Property Type & Location: PP, Enfield, CT

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

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

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

OR

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

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

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓

☒ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	<u>24,500</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-24500</u>
Totals	<u>24,500</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-24500</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 36

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Farms Jarmoc Real Estate

Property Type & Location: 65 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, Pat master

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

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

OR

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

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

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>891,100</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 891,100</u>
Building	<u>258,900</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 258,900</u>
Out Buildings	<u>130,900</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 130,900</u>
Personal Property	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
Totals	<u>1,280,900</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 1,280,900</u>

Repeated Reluctation by down

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 37

Decision Date: 4-24-25

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

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 Jarmoc, Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>58,800</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-58,800</u>
Building	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
Out Buildings	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
Personal Property	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
Totals	<u>58,800</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-58,800</u>

Repeated Retribution by town

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 38

Decision Date: _____

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoc Farms & Jarmoc Owen Jarmoc
Pat Martin

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: OT & PM

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

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

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

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>359200</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-359200</u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>359200</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-359200</u>

Repeated Retribution by town

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 39

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Farms & Garmoe Real Estate

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 Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>614,300</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-614300</u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>-614,300</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-614,300</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 40

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Siemens Financial Services

Property Type & Location: PP, 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 show up for hearing
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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

	Unanimous	
<u>Dan. & DeGray</u>	☒	
Donna Dubanoski	____	Yay ____ Nay
Lori Longhi	____	Yay ____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	____	Yay ____ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>59,710</u>	<u>59,710</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>59,710</u>	<u>59,710</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 41

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Groszyk Farm LLC / Att. Urbanowicz

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: Att. U.

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 Daniel DeGray and seconded by Lori Longhi

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

	Unanimous	
~~Dan DeGray~~	~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☒ Yay ☐ Nay
	Lori Longhi	☒ Yay ☐ Nay
	Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay <u>Recuse</u>

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property MV	<u>4440</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-4440</u>
Totals	<u>4440</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-4440</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 42

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Groszyk Farm LLC / Att Urbanowicz

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: Att. U.

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 Daniel DeGray and seconded by Lori Longhi

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

	Unanimous	
~~Daniel DeGray~~	~~Donna Dubanoski~~	<u>✓</u> Yay ___ Nay
	Lori Longhi	<u>✓</u> Yay ___ Nay
	Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay <i>Recused</i>

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
~~Personal Property~~ <i>MV</i>	<u>3650</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 3650</u>
Totals	<u>3650</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 3650</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 43

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Groszyk Farm LLC / Att. Urbanowicz

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: Att. U.

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 Daniel DeGray and seconded by Lori Longhi

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

	Unanimous	
<i>Daniel DeGray</i>	~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☒ Yay ☐ Nay
	Lori Longhi	☒ Yay ☐ Nay
	Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay <i>RECUSED</i>

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	<u>10,050</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 10,050</u>
Totals	<u>10,050</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 10,050</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 45

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Groszyk Farm LLC

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: Att. 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 Daniel DeGray and seconded by Lori Longhi

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

	Unanimous	
<i>Daniel De Gray</i>	☒ Yay	☐ Nay
~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☒ Yay	☐ Nay
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay	☐ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay	☐ Nay

RECEIVED

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property <i>MV</i>	<u>3630</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 3630</u>
Totals	<u>3630</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 3630</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 46

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Andre Groszyk Farm LLC

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: Att. 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 Daniel DeGray and seconded by Lori Longhi

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

	Unanimous	
~~Daniel DeGray~~	~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☒ Yay ☐ Nay
	Lori Longhi	☒ Yay ☐ Nay
	Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay <u>RECUSED</u>

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>2610</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-2610</u>
Totals	<u>2610</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-2610</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 47

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Grozyk Farm LLC / Matt Urbanowicz

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 Daniel DeGray and seconded by Lori Longhi

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

	Unanimous	
Daniel DeGray	Donna Dubanoski	☒ Yay ☐ Nay
	Lori Longhi	☒ Yay ☐ Nay
	Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay <u>RECUSED</u>

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>4900</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-4900</u>
Totals	<u>4900</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-4900</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 48

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Enfield CT GSR
Glen Saindon, CBRE

Property Type & Location: 180 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: _____

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

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

OR

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

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

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

☒

___ Yay ___ Nay

___ Yay ___ Nay

___ Yay ___ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>868,700</u>	<u>723,990</u>	<u>-144,710</u>
Building	<u>2,804,300</u>	<u>2,236,315</u>	<u>-460,285</u>
Out Buildings	<u>90,800</u>	<u>90,800</u>	<u>-0-</u>
Personal Property			
Totals	<u>3,763,800</u>	<u>3,051,105</u>	<u>-604,995</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 49

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: 131 Town Farm Rd LLC Owen Garmoc

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 Garmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

☒

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>7300</u>	<u>7300</u>	<u>0</u>
Building	<u>6800</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-6800</u>
Out Buildings			
Personal Property			
Totals	<u>14,100</u>	<u>7300</u>	<u>-6800</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 50

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Dallas Wood

Property Type & Location: 49 Steele 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: DW

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

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

OR

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

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

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>64,600</u>	<u>64,600</u>	<u>0</u>
Building	<u>257,600</u>	<u>257,600</u>	<u>0</u>
Out Buildings	<u>12,400</u>	<u>12,400</u>	<u>0</u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>334,600</u>	<u>334,600</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 51

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Michele Zukowski

Property Type & Location: 10 Sparkle 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
We can't go back in time

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

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓

____ Yay ____ Nay

____ Yay ____ Nay

____ Yay ____ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>59,100</u>	<u>59,100</u>	<u>0</u>
Building	<u>90,200</u>	<u>90,200</u>	<u>0</u>
Out Buildings	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>0</u>
Personal Property	_____	_____	_____
Totals	<u>149,400</u>	<u>149,400</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 52

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Olga Kamensky

Property Type & Location: 21 Elm Meadows, Enfield, CT

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

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

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

OR

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

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

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u>140,000</u>	<u>140,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>140,000</u>	<u>140,000</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 53

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Michaels Store

Property Type & Location: PP, 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 show up for the hearing

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

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

OR

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

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

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

☒
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>147630</u>	<u>147630</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>147630</u>	<u>147630</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 54

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Danny Pizza / Daniel Poggie

Property Type & Location: PP 2021, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Dan Levine, 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

	Unanimous	
<u>Daniel DeGray</u>	☒	
Donna Dubanoski	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	

Pertaining to 2021 Audit year:

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	<u>73,020</u>	<u>11,340</u>	<u>-61,680</u>
Totals	<u>73,020</u>	<u>11,340</u>	<u>-61,680</u>

The BAA further voted to reduce the penalty for 2021 to \$10 as the auditor failed to follow generally accepted accounting principles and therefore the penalty was reduced.

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 55

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Danny Pizza / Daniel Poggie

Property Type & Location: PP 2022, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Dan Levine, 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

	Unanimous	☒
Daniel DeGray	~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
	Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
	Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

Pertaining to the 2022 Audit Year:

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>70,780</u>	<u>11,340</u>	<u>-59,440</u>
Totals	<u>70,780</u>	<u>11,340</u>	<u>-59,440</u>

The BAA further voted to reduce the penalty for 2022 to \$10 as the auditor failed to follow generally accepted accounting principles and Therefore the penalty was reduced.

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 56

Decision Date: 4/24/2025

Property Owner/Agent: Danny's Pizza / Daniel Poggie

Property Type & Location: Personal Property 2023, Enfield, CT

Having been duly sworn, evidence in support of this appeal was received in the above matter, by way of oral testimony from: Dan Levine, 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

☒ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

Pertaining to the 2023 Audit Year:

	Old Assessment	New Assessment	Difference
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	<u>68,560</u>	<u>11,340</u>	<u>-57,220</u>
Totals	<u>68,560</u>	<u>11,340</u>	<u>-57,220</u>

The BAA further voted to reduce the penalty for 2023 to \$10 as the auditor failed to follow generally accepted accounting principles, and therefore the penalty was reduced.

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 57

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Enfield Hunters Club Inc. - Atty. Ed Krzakowski

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: _____

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

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

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

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

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

	Unanimous	<u>✓</u>
<i>Daniel DeGray</i>	Donna Dubanoski	___ Yay ___ Nay
	Lori Longhi	___ Yay ___ Nay
	Andrew Urbanowicz	___ Yay ___ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>40,790</u>	<u>13,800</u>	<u>-26,990</u>
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	_____	_____	_____
Totals	<u>40,790</u>	<u>13,800</u>	<u>-26,990</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 58

Decision Date: 4/24/25

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: E.K.

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

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

OR

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

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

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

	Unanimous	
~~Daniel DeGray~~	☒	
Donna Dubanoski	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>2050</u>	<u>700</u>	<u>1350</u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>2050</u>	<u>700</u>	<u>1350</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 59

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Enfield Hunters Club INC Attorney Ed Kozanowski

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: _____

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

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

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

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

	Unanimous	☒
<i>Daniel DeGray</i>	~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
	Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
	Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>44620</u>	<u>15,120</u>	<u>\$29,500</u>
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	_____	_____	_____
Totals	<u>44620</u>	<u>15,120</u>	<u>-29,500</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 60

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Enfield Hunters Club Edward Krzanowski - Attorney

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: _____

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

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

OR

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

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

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

	Unanimous	
<u>Daniel DeGray</u>	☒	
~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>75,730</u>	<u>25,650</u>	<u>-50,080</u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>75,730</u>	<u>25,650</u>	<u>-50,080</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 61

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Nicholas Larivee

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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

	Unanimous	☒
<i>Daniel DeGray</i>	~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
	Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay
	Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property <i>MV</i>	<u>46,390</u>	<u>32,900</u>	<u>-13,490</u>
Totals	<u>46,390</u>	<u>32,900</u>	<u>-13,490</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 162

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Glen & Susan Basale

Property Type & Location: 19 Longview 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: CB & S.B.

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

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

OR

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

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

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

	Unanimous	
<u>Daniel DeGray</u>	☒	
~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
Lori Longhi	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	
Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay	

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>47,600</u>	<u>47,600</u>	<u>-0-</u>
Building	<u>178,100</u>	<u>168,100</u>	<u>-10,000</u>
Out Buildings	<u>16,900</u>	<u>16,900</u>	<u>0</u>
Personal Property			
Totals	<u>242,600</u>	<u>232,600</u>	<u>-10,000</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 63

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: BB Produce / Att. Urbanowicz

Property Type & Location: PP, 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 Daniel DeGray and seconded by Lori Longhi

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

	Unanimous	
<i>Daniel DeGray</i>	☒ Yay	☐ Nay
<i>Donna Dubanoski</i>	☒ Yay	☐ Nay
<i>Lori Longhi</i>	☐ Yay	☐ Nay
<i>Andrew Urbanowicz</i>		<i>RECUSED</i>

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>4580</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 4580</u>
Totals	<u>4580</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 4580</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 64

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Andrew Urbanowicz

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: A.U.

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 Daniel DeGray and seconded by Lori Longhi

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

	Unanimous	
~~Daniel DeGray~~	~~Yay~~	~~Nay~~
~~Donna Dubanoski~~	~~Yay~~	~~Nay~~
Lori Longhi	Yay	Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	Yay	Nay RECUSED

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

Vicki Removed from list which is the correct thing to do

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 65

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Raffia Farms / A+ Urbanowicz

Property Type & Location: PP, 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.U.

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 Daniel DeGray and seconded by Lori Longhi

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

	Unanimous	
~~Daniel DeGray~~	~~Donna Dubanoski~~	☒ Yay ☐ Nay
	Lori Longhi	☒ Yay ☐ Nay
	Andrew Urbanowicz	☐ Yay ☐ Nay <i>Recused</i>

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land			
Building			
Out Buildings			
Personal Property	<u>154,310</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>-154,300</u>
<i>Exempt</i>			
Totals	<u>154,310</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>-154,300</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 666

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Jacob Burnham

Property Type & Location: 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: J.B

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

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

OR

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

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

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓

☒ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

The field card has an error on the Appraised value
should be 71,250 Not 140,700 Assessment is correct

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>14230</u>	<u>14230</u>	<u>0</u>
Building	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
Out Buildings	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
Personal Property	<u>11000</u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
Totals	<u>14230</u>	<u>14230</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 67-113

Decision Date: _____

Property Owner/Agent: CT Mulch Distributors Inc Kurt Lindeland
Attorney Carl Landolina

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: KL & Carl Landolina

They withdrew appeals 67-113 at this time

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

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

OR

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

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

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

	Unanimous	
~~Daniel DeGray~~ Donna Dubanoski	_____	Yay _____ Nay
Lori Longhi	_____	Yay _____ Nay
Andrew Urbanowicz	_____	Yay _____ Nay

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

Withdrew Appeals 67-113

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 114

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers

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: Owen Jarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>25370</u>	<u>25370</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>25370</u>	<u>25370</u>	<u>- 0 -</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 115

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Transportation

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: Owen Jarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓
___ Yay ___ Nay

___ Yay ___ Nay

___ Yay ___ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>80580</u>	<u>80580</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>80580</u>	<u>80580</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 116

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers

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: Owen Tarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>7030</u>	<u>7030</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>7030</u>	<u>7030</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 117

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers

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: Owen Jarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>11,830</u>	<u>11830</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>11,830</u>	<u>11830</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 118

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers

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: Owen Jarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>5790</u>	<u>5790</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>5790</u>	<u>5790</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 119

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers

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: Owen Janmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓
 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>5790</u>	<u>5790</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>5790</u>	<u>5790</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 120

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers

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: Owen Jarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>8580</u>	<u>8580</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>8580</u>	<u>8580</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 121

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

✓

Daniel DeGray

 Yay Nay

Lori Longhi

 Yay Nay

Andrew Urbanowicz

 Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>4910</u>	<u>4910</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>4910</u>	<u>4910</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 1221

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>6910</u>	<u>6910</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>6910</u>	<u>6910</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 123

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat Maslin

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

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

OR

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

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

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>121</u>	<u>5860</u>	<u>5860</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>5860</u>	<u>5860</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 124

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers

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: Owen Jarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property- <u>MV</u>	<u>20 200</u>	<u>20,200</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>20 200</u>	<u>20,200</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 125

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers

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: Owen Tarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓
 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>16950</u>	<u>16950</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>16950</u>	<u>16950</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 126

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers

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: Owen Jarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>25110</u>	<u>25110</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>25110</u>	<u>25110</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 127

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers

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: Owen Tarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>33060</u>	<u>33060</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>33060</u>	<u>33060</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 128

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers

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: Owen Jarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>19210</u>	<u>19210</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>19210</u>	<u>19210</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 129

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>4080</u>	<u>4080</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>4080</u>	<u>4080</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 130

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Transportation

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: Owen Jarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>6880</u>	<u>6880</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>6880</u>	<u>6880</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 131

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Transportation

Property Type & Location: MU, 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
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property. <u>MU</u>	<u>120,840</u>	<u>120,840</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>120,840</u>	<u>120,840</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 132

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Transportation

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: Owen Jarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓
 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>20060</u>	<u>20060</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>20060</u>	<u>20060</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 133

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers

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: Owen Jarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>500</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 134

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers

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: Owen Jarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>500</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>500</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 135

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Conowers

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: Owen Tarmoc

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

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

OR

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

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

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>2240</u>	<u>2240</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>2240</u>	<u>2240</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 134

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers

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: Owen Tannoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>10110</u>	<u>10110</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>10110</u>	<u>10110</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 137

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>4590</u>	<u>4590</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>4590</u>	<u>4590</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 138

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Jarmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Jarmoe
Pat Maslin

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

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

OR

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

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

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>10790</u>	<u>10790</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>10790</u>	<u>10790</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 139

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>11800</u>	<u>Exempt</u>	<u>-11800</u>
Totals	<u>11800</u>	<u>Exempt</u>	<u>-11800</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 140

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>4980</u>	<u>4980</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>4980</u>	<u>4980</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 141

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓
___ Yay ___ Nay
___ Yay ___ Nay
___ Yay ___ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>3730</u>	<u>3730</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>3730</u>	<u>3730</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 142

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat Maslin

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

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

OR

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

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

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>5520</u>	<u>5520</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>5520</u>	<u>5520</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 143

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>7100</u>	<u>7100</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>7100</u>	<u>7100</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 144

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>6480</u>	<u>6480</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>6480</u>	<u>6480</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 145

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
- Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>12600</u>	<u>12600</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>12600</u>	<u>12600</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 146

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓
 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>7830</u>	<u>7830</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>7830</u>	<u>7830</u>	<u> </u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 147

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat Maslin

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

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

OR

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

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

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>12220</u>	<u>12220</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>12220</u>	<u>12220</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 148

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

☒
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>4870</u>	<u>Exempt</u>	<u>-4870</u>
Totals	<u>4870</u>	<u>Exempt</u>	<u>-4870</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 149

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat Maslin

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

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

OR

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

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

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>4870</u>	<u>Exempt</u>	<u>-4870</u>
Totals	<u>4870</u>	<u>Exempt</u>	<u>-4870</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 150

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>6030</u>	<u>6030</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>6030</u>	<u>6030</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 151

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>7810</u>	<u>7810</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>7810</u>	<u>7810</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 152

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
~~Personal Property~~ <u>MV</u>	<u>5370</u>	<u>5370</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>5370</u>	<u>5370</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 153

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>3470</u>	<u>3470</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>3470</u>	<u>3470</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 154

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>7080</u>	<u>7080</u>	<u>0</u>
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Totals	<u>7080</u>	<u>7080</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 155

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat Maslin

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

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

OR

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

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

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>5000</u>	<u>5000</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>5000</u>	<u>5000</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 156

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat Maslin

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

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

OR

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

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

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>6700</u>	<u>6700</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>6700</u>	<u>6700</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 157

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>3470</u>	<u>3470</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>3470</u>	<u>3470</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 158

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat Maslin

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

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

OR

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

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

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>9990</u>	<u>9990</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>9990</u>	<u>9990</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 159

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay
____ Yay ____ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>3540</u>	<u>3540</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>3540</u>	<u>3540</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 160

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Garmoe Tobacco LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat Maslin

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

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

OR

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

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

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property <u>MV</u>	<u>10790</u>	<u>10790</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>10790</u>	<u>10790</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 161

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers LLC

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: Owen Tarmoc
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property' <u>MV</u>	<u>16 950</u>	<u>16 950</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>16 950</u>	<u>16 950</u>	<u>0</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 162

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: CT Valley Growers LLC

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: Owen Garmoe
Pat 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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

✓

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

 Yay Nay

Land

Building

Out Buildings

Personal Property

Totals

Old Assessment

New Assessment

Difference

20200

20200

0

20200

20200

0

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 163

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Ann Furey & Joan Burnham

Property Type & Location: 39 Oliver 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: Tom Burnham - agent / spouse

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

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

OR

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

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

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

☒ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

☐ Yay ☐ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u>57100</u>	<u>57100</u>	<u>0</u>
Building	<u>111900</u>	<u>111900</u>	<u>0</u>
Out Buildings	<u>75200</u>	<u>56200</u>	<u>-19000</u>
~~Personal Property~~ Farm	<u>1540</u>	<u>1540</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>245740</u>	<u>226740</u>	<u>-19000</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 1164

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: TCB Services LLC Tom Barham

Property Type & Location: PP, Enfield, CT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Building	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Out Buildings	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Personal Property	<u>26470</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>-26465</u>
Totals	<u>26470</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>-26465</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 145

Decision Date: 4/24/25

Property Owner/Agent: Mark Snukis

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 Andrew Urbanowicz and seconded by Daniel DeGray

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

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

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property → MV	<u>8,400</u>	<u>8,400</u>	<u>- 0 -</u>
Totals	<u>8,400</u>	<u>8,400</u>	<u>- 0 -</u>

2025 DECISION MINUTES

Board of Assessment Appeals

Appeal Number: 166

Decision Date: 4-24-25

Property Owner/Agent: Kevin Walsh

Property Type & Location: PP, 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 show up for hearing

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

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

OR

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

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

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

Unanimous

Daniel DeGray

Lori Longhi

Andrew Urbanowicz

☒ Yay _____ Nay

_____ Yay _____ Nay

_____ Yay _____ Nay

	<u>Old Assessment</u>	<u>New Assessment</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Land	_____	_____	_____
Building	_____	_____	_____
Out Buildings	_____	_____	_____
Personal Property	<u>630</u>	<u>630</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	<u>630</u>	<u>630</u>	<u>0</u>

