

# Minutes of Board of Assessment Appeals Meeting - 04/05/22

**Date and time:** 04/05/22 6:00 PM to: 04/05/22 9:00 PM  
**Present:** Brooke Stevens, Recording Secretary, Patrick Hughes, Chair, Mike Bekech, Gary Cicchiello, Suzanne Szupiany  
**CC:** Absent: Kim Kalajainen  
**Location:** East Lyme Town Hall- (T. Lee Room- Downstairs)  
108 Pennsylvania Avenue, Niantic, CT, 06357  
**Link:** <https://app.meetingking.com/meetings/374767>

FILED

## Topics

### 1. Call to Order

April 18 2022 AT 8:10 AM/PM  
Ann Hulm  
EAST LYME TOWN CLERK

**Note** Mr. Hughes called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

#### **Decision** MOTION (1)

Mr. Hughes moved to add APPEAL 5585, JONATHAN ALLISON; 63 WALNUT HILL RD, to this evening's agenda.

Ms. Szupiany seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 4-0-0.

### 2. Appeals by Appointment Only

#### 2-1. 6:00 PM- APPEAL 5890, BARBARA MLYNARSKI; 6 FERRO CT

**Note** Mr. Hughes swore Mr. Mlynarski in.

**Note** Mr. Mlynarski said some of the following:

The reason for the appeal is the increase in appraised value in excess compared to the comps in similar neighborhoods.

They received a new 42% increase over the previous value.

He went through their neighborhood as well as adjacent ones and came up with the median. percent increases for those neighborhoods.

**Note** Mr. Hughes noted the land value pretty much stayed the same, but the value of the dwelling went up. He asked if they have an outbuilding and Mr. Mlynarski said they have a pool house.

**Note** Mr. Bekech asked about the pool and Mr. Mlynarski said it was installed in 1993 but it has leaking pipes and cracked concrete; it requires maintenance at a substantial expense but is still usable.

**Note** Mr. Mlynarski said he was prompted to appeal the assessment when he spoke with others who only received a 19-21% increase. He added that he feels the property is worth \$501,000 to 510,000 which would have been a 20% increase and more in line with the comparable properties around him.

#### 2-2. 6:15 PM- APPEAL 5585, JONATHAN ALLISON; 63 WALNUT HILL RD

**Note** Mr. Hughes swore Jonathan Allison and his father in.

**Note** Mr. Allison and his father said some of the following:

He was here for this property in 2019.

When he purchased this property, it had been on the market for over 10 years.

The sloping of the driveway and lack of access make any development unlikely.

He would have to obtain driveway rights and the property is adjacent to the solar field.

It would cost over \$50,000 just to address the small piece to get to the wetlands.

**Note** Mr. Hughes and Mr. Allison discussed how the Board previously lowered the property assessment to \$77,000 because of the accessibility issues. Mr. Allison said he thinks an evaluation of \$60,000 is more accurate and noted it's currently assessed at \$85,000.

**Note** The Appellant and Board further discussed the property.

### **2-3. 6:30 PM- APPEAL 6260, JEFFREY TAYLOR; 16 BLACK OAK DR**

**Decision** This Appellant has withdrawn their Appeal.

### **2-4. 6:45 PM- APPEAL 7392, BARBARA WISHART; 21 LEDGE RD**

**Note** Mr. Hughes swore Stacy Kaminski in, who was in attendance to represent Barbara Wishart.

**Note** Ms. Kaminski shared some of the following:

Her husband's grandfather owned the property and spent most of his life trying to obtain the beach association dock that is located in the middle of their backyard.

They got lawyers involved but had no success.

She asked why it is that the land unit price for smaller lots are higher.

Their home has some of the same characteristics as 25 Ledge Road and 21 Ledge Road.

In comparison with 25 Ledge Road, with the new assessment they're \$79,000 higher for 1/100th of a unit.

They all are similar in appearance, have the same ledge, but they have a right-of-way.

28 Ledge is getting a discount of 25% because of their ledge topography and right-of-way but they're not receiving anything.

**Note** The Board and Appellant further discussed the property.

**Note** Mr. Hughes observed that the issue they have is with the land value and Ms. Kaminski responded that the land value, external factors, and the community dock in their yard is a big thing for them.

**Note** Ms. Kaminski detailed the difficulty they have because of the dock, people are noisy on the dock, party all the time, walk up their stairs in the middle of the night, and look through their windows.

**Note** Ms. Kaminski said an assessment of \$379,890, and a fair market value of \$542,000 would bring the property more up to speed.

### **2-5. 6:45 PM- APPEAL 7392, BARBARA WISHART; 21 LEDGE RD Deliberation**

**Decision** MOTION (2)

Mr. Bekech moved to change the condition of the land from 5 to 4.25 and change the depreciation code on the building from average to average-fair.

Ms. Szupiany seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 4-0-0.

### **2-6. 7:00 PM- APPEAL 2204, SYLVIA CARRIE TR; 29 S LEE RD**

**Note** Mr. Hughes swore Mr. and Mrs. Henninger in.

**Note** The Carrie's said the assessment seems excessive to them since they haven't made any improvements and asked how the assessment process works.

**Note** Mr. Hughes detailed how Vision Appraisal is responsible for all the reevaluations.

**Note** The Appellant discussed how the assessment was previously \$285,000 and is now \$359,000; the Appellant thinks the appraised value should be \$41,000 less than the current \$513,000 appraisal.

## **2-7. 7:00 PM- APPEAL 2204, SYLVIA CARRIE TR; 29 S LEE RD Deliberation**

**Note** The Board briefly discussed the appeal and noted the comparable properties the Appellant cited is like comparing apples to oranges.

**Decision** MOTION (3)

Mr. Bekech moved to take no action.

Ms. Szupiany seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 4-0-0.

## **2-8. 7:15 PM- APPEAL 2709, MARIA MOULTHROP; 71 QUARRY DOCK RD**

**Note** Mr. Hughes swore Maria and Bruce Moulthrop in.

**Note** Ms. Moulthrop discussed how the value of the house has increased when in actuality, it's falling apart. She provided photos and noted the deterioration from the house being on the water, how's there's black mold, and how all the windows need to be pulled out and replaced. Ms. Moulthrop detailed how they had to physically pull the deck off the house and put tarp paper and asphalt down to hold them through, until they could get some contractors to take a look at it; the estimate for repair is \$150,000.

**Note** Mr. Hughes noted the value of the residential land went up substantially.

**Note** Ms. Moulthrop discussed how she and her neighbors shared the same view and deep water but unlike her neighbors, they don't have a fixed dock and have less acreage.

**Note** Ms. Szupiany observed that the land went up \$130,000 and Ms. Moulthrop said she would end up taking a loss if she were to sell it given the current condition.

## **2-9. 7:15 PM- APPEAL 2709, MARIA MOULTHROP; 71 QUARRY DOCK RD Deliberation**

**Note** The Board discussed the property.

**Decision** MOTION (4)

Mr. Bekech moved to change the value from 5 to 4.5 and change the building condition from good to average.

Ms. Szupiany seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 4-0-0.

## **2-10. 7:45 PM- APPEAL 5019, STEPHEN & DENEEN JANTY; 121 S EDGEWOOD RD**

**Note** Mr. Hughes swore Mr. and Mrs. Janty in.

**Note** Mr. Janty said both lots are exactly the same although one is assessed higher than the other. Mr. Bekech noted a building permit was previously pulled which usually constitutes a 15% difference. Ms. Janty said they never used the permit, it has expired, and contacted the Tax Assessor's office to let them know that.

**Note** The Janty's feel the appraisal should be \$70,000.

**Note** The Board and Appellant discussed the lot.

**Note** Mr. Janty said he would be comfortable with the lots being assessed at the same amount.

## **2-11. 7:45 PM- APPEAL 5019, STEPHEN & DENEEN JANTY; 123 S EDGEWOOD RD**

**Note** The Jantys' used this property to illustrate that 121 South Edgewood is currently overvalued.

## **2-12. Decisions/Deliberations if time permits**

**Decision** 7:45 PM- APPEAL 5019, STEPHEN & DENEEN JANTY; 121 S EDGEWOOD RD- MOTION (5)

Mr. Bekech moved to change the land condition from 1 to .85.

Ms. Szupiany seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 4-0-0.

**Decision** 7:45 PM- APPEAL 5019, STEPHEN & DENEEN JANTY; 123 S EDGEWOOD RD- MOTION (6)

Mr. Bekech moved to make no change.

Ms. Szupiany seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 4-0-0.

## **2-13. 8:00 PM- APPEAL 2067, ROGER DWYER; 43 S COBBLERS CT**

**Decision** This Appellant did not appear; no action taken.

## **2-14. 8:15 PM- APPEAL 2150, MICHAEL & LISA DIPIRO; 152 UPPER PATTAGANSETT RD**

**Note** Mr. Hughes swore Mr. Dipiro in.

**Note** Mr. Dipiro feels the fair market value should be \$446,900 and right now the fair market value is listed at \$645,000.

**Note** Mr. Dipiro shared some of the following:

He has no issue with the land appraisal.

When they bought the property, they had an inspection done but weren't informed that they had no frost barrier.

They have no foundation, and the house is slanted.

This wasn't discovered until they put an addition on and if they had known, they wouldn't have paid what they did for the home.

**Note** Mr. Dipiro detailed how the deck rotted away and the main bathroom didn't empty into the septic system; the house is graded as 76% good which isn't accurate. He discussed the cracks and slanted flooring in the home.

**Note** Mr. Dipiro briefly discussed dwellings in the vicinity which are nicer than his but assessed at a lower amount. He said he shared all the info he has discussed with Vision Appraisal, and they lowered it by \$50,000 but it's still out of wack.

**Note** Mr. Dipiro said the condition isn't "very good" but average and would be happy to welcome anyone who wishes to view it for themselves. Mr. Bekech said he will stop by to view the property.

**Note** Mr. Cicchello asked if no windows and siding were put in when the addition was done, and Mr. Dipiro responded they were not.

## **2-15. 8:30 PM- APPEAL 5785, SCOTT & ELIZABETH KIMBLE; 32 LEGENDARY RD**

**Note** The Kimble's said once they received the assessment from Vision Appraisal, they felt it was high, so they had their own appraisal done. Vision valued the property at \$371,000 and they believe the 325,000 (per their appraisal) is more accurate.

**Note** The Appellant discussed the appraisal they had done.

## **2-16. 9:00 PM- APPEAL 7040, ANDREW TOWPASZ; 7 ISLANDA CT**

**Note** Mr. Hughes swore Mr. Towpasz in.

**Note** Mr. Towpasz said some of the following:

He did a lot line revision to accommodate a garage on their property.

An easement was done to allow garage access from the vacant lot.

60% of the land left over in that reduced lot is wetlands and the other half contains his driveway.

He's looking for some relief and estimates it's worth \$25,000.

Vision said they were going to send someone to view the property, but he has security cameras, and no one has come.

## **3. Deliberations/Decisions if time permits**

**Note** No further deliberations were done.

## **4. Adjournment**

**Decision** MOTION (7)

Mr. Hughes adjourned the April 5th, 2022, Board of Assessment Appeals Meeting at 8:47 p.m.

Ms. Szupiany seconded the motion.

Motion carried, 4-0-0.

**Note** Respectfully Submitted,  
Brooke Stevens, Recording Secretary