

Minutes of Board of Assessment Appeals Meeting - 04/04/22

Date and time: 04/04/22 06:00 pm to: 04/04/22 09:00 pm
Present: Brooke Stevens, Recording Secretary, Patrick Hughes, Chair, Mike Bekech, Kim Kalajainen, Suzanne Szupiany, Gary Cicchiello
CC: Diane Vitagliano, Assessor
Location: East Lyme Town Hall- (Conference Room 1)
108 Pennsylvania Avenue, Niantic, CT, 06357

FILED

April 14, 2022 AT 8:16 AM/PM
Brooke Stevens ATC
EAST LYME TOWN CLERK

Topics

1. Call to Order

Note Chairman Hughes called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and Ms. Vitagliano welcomed the Board via zoom.

2. Appeals by Appointment Only

2-1. 6:00 PM- APPEAL 5787, DIANE MCANDREWS; 5 CRAB LB

Decision This appeal has been withdrawn by the Applicant.

2-2. 6:15 PM- APPEAL 41563, PETER & DIANE TRAYGIS; ISLANDA CAMPGROUND

Note Mr. Hughes swore Ms. Traygis and her son in, and she noted she appealed last year, her request was granted, and she's appealing for the same reasons this year. She said she has the same photos that she showed last year, and it doesn't get any better, but worse. Ms. Traygis said the floors are no rotten. <https://eltownhall.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Traygis-Hearing-Photos.pdf>

Note Mr. Bekech observed that the condition is certainly no better than last year, and Mr. Hughes said he will take a look at it even though he's sure it's the same.

Note Ms. Kalajainen arrived at 6:30 p.m.

2-3. 6:30 PM- APPEAL 7163, WILLIAM LASELLA; 20 HERITAGE RD

Note This Applicant did not attend the scheduled hearing.

2-4. 6:45 PM- APPEAL 5207, ANDREA & ROBERT GREENE; 108 LAURELWOOD DR

Note Mr. Hughes swore Mr. and Mrs. Greene in.

Note Mr. and Mrs. Greene said some of the following:
They bought their home last April and have provided a copy of the appraisal that was done at that time. The house appraised for \$440,000 and the new assessment would bring the new appraised value to \$528,200.
There is no longer a fireplace outside and where it was, is not in good condition.

Note The Board and Appellant discussed the property.

Note The Board verified the square footage of the home and Mr. Hughes said he will drive by the house to take a look at it.

2-5. 7:00 PM- APPEAL 7100, JEANNE SUMMERHAYES & DANIEL SHEA; 7 TERRACE AVE

Note Mr. Hughes swore Mr. Shea in.

Note Mr. Shea detailed how there is a parcel along their property which is approximately 2-3 feet wide; it's a Crescent Beach strip of land, and their home is on property in Oak Grove, and goes across their driveway.

Note Mr. Shea said he was here in 2017 and the parcel was reduced. he noted the latest assessment brings it back up to \$2,100 and he thinks it should be \$500.

Note Mr. Bekech explained for real property he'd have to come before the Board every five years. Mr. Shea said he's looking to retain the previous assessment.

Note The Board and Appellant discussed the property.

2-6. 7:15 PM- APPEAL 5403, SCOTT BUCKMAN; 11 HATHAWAY

Note Mr. Hughes swore Mr. Buckman in.

Note Mr. Buckman shared the following:

He purchased his home in November last year.

\$475,000 was the purchase price, they had an appraisal done, which was \$480,000.

The initial revaluation from Vision came back at \$640,000 and after his informal telephone hearing it was lowered to \$585,000.

He feels that \$480,000 is more reflective of the property's worth.

Note Mr. Bekech said he took a ride by the house this morning and noticed the back of the house is right on the road and seems to drop dramatically from the back of the house down to the lake. Mr. Buckman responded that there's not much usable land- there's their driveway and the land the house sits on.

Note The Appellant discussed how the builder never completed the house, only 80% of the interior is done, and he's working on finishing the projects that were never completed. He explained they don't have paint on our walls, it's all drywall and then finishing, and the floors don't completely fit.

2-7. 7:30 PM- APPEAL 1068, WILLIAM CARR; 23 CHERRY ST

Note Mr. Hughes swore Mr. Carr in.

Note Mr. Carr noted he has three main points he'd like to address:

1. During the vision appraiser's second visit he challenged the square footage of the house because they had it listed as 3,300+ square footage and he's always believed it to be 2,900-3,000. When they remeasured, they reduced that figure to 2,860; the appraised value was only \$20,000 and they didn't give an explanation for that.

He got a 15% reduction, and he doesn't understand how that translates to \$20,000.

2. The house was built at the turn of the century and there are several 3/4 walls; the right-hand side of the house is all 3/4 walls on the second floor, and they increased it by 20 feet on their second visit.

He feels there's about 600 square feet in the middle of the house that was missed.

3. He looked at some comps on the street to see what percentage everybody's appraised value went up- 29 Cherry Street went up 11%, 17 Cherry Street went up 16.6%, 1 Cherry Street went up 10%, 11 Cherry Street went up 16.5%, and his house went up 18.75%.

He noted he hasn't put an addition on the house.

He also noted that he's been arguing for years that Pine Grove is not like other shoreline communities such as Black Point; it has a lot of derelict homes in it and a lot of cottages that are not heated.

Pine Grove is a grade below the other beach communities and there has never been a house sold in Pine Grove for more than \$590,000.

The appraised value of his home is \$733,900.

Note The Appellant further discussed the Pine Grove neighborhood with the Board.

2-8. 7:45 PM- APPEAL 4931, ROBERT & JANET GUENTHER; 17 BELLAIRE RD

Note Mr. Hughes swore Mr. and Mrs. Guenther in.

Note Mr. Guenther said some of the following:

They're happy to pay their taxes but don't like to be paying more than their fair share.

They feel that a 32.5% in their assessment is extraordinarily high compared to all the other properties.

It seems unfair that we should have such a high percentage compared to everyone else when they've had no improvements since the last evaluation.

His appraisal estimate is \$488,000.

He would have no problem with the increase if the homes around him received the same increase.

Note Mr. Guenther and the Board briefly discussed comparable properties in the neighborhood.

2-9. Deliberations/Decisions if time permits

Decision -7:45 PM- APPEAL 4931, ROBERT & JANET GUENTHER; 17 BELLAIRE RD DELIBERATION:
Mr. Hughes noted Mr. Guenther had a good point.

MOTION (1)

Mr. Bekech moved to change the depreciation code from very good to good.

Ms. Szupiany seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 5-0-0.

2-10. 8:00 PM- APPEAL 5585, JONATHAN ALLISON; 63 WALNUT HILL RD

Decision This Appellant has rescheduled their hearing for April 5th, 2022.

2-11. 8:15 PM- APPEAL 6072, STEVEN & ROSEMARIE TABER; 36 SHORE RD OGBA

Note Mr. Hughes swore Mr. and Mrs. Taber in.

Mr. and Mrs. Taber said some of the following:

It's a 3-room house not 7; two bedrooms upstairs and one big room downstairs.

The house next to them (32 Shore Road) is exactly the same, has the same square footage, and is valued \$20,000 less than theirs.

They think it would be fair if they were assessed at the same amount as their neighbors- \$341,000.

Mr. Cicchello asked how the condition of their home compares to 32 Shore Road and Mrs. Taber said they're both in the same condition.

The Appellant further discussed how their home is similar to 32 Shore Road.

2-12. 8:30 PM- APPEAL 6738, THEODORE SUDAL; 33 CRESCENT AVE

Note Mr. Hughes swore Mr. Sudal in.

Mr. Sudal shared some of the following;

His property increased 48%.

He lives in a house 500 feet away, similar in structure and it increased 24%.

48% is excessive and nothing has been done to the house.

Mr. Hughes observed that the appraisal of the dwelling went up considerably and Mr. Sudal said 24% is still high but easier to swallow than 48%; the neighborhood isn't a quiet place.

The Appellant and Board further discussed the house.

Mr. Hughes said the appraisal is \$497,000 and Mr. Sudal said it should be \$433,000.

3. 8:45 PM- APPEAL 5588, EDWARD & KATHERINE TOMASZEK; 23 WALNUT HILL RD

Note Mr. Hughes swore Mr. and Mrs. Tomaszek in.

Mr. and Mrs. Tomaszek said some of the following:

They received an assessment for \$270,700 and they had actually gotten an assessment done on their property in late May or early June, and they had assessed it at \$240,000.

The new appraised value was as of October, so the home increased \$30,000 in 6 months.

Any improvements they did on the home such as renovating the bathroom, was included in the appraisal they did in May/June.

The Board and Appellant further discussed the property.

4. Deliberations/Decisions if time permits

Note There were no further deliberations.

5. Adjournment

Decision MOTION (2)

Ms. Szupiany moved to adjourn the April 4th, 2022, Board of Assessment Appeals Meeting at 8:47 p.m.

Ms. Kalajainen seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 5-0-0.

Note Respectfully Submitted,

Brooke Stevens, Recording Secretary









