

BOARD OF ASSESSMENT APPEALS  
MARCH 18, 2016  
MINUTES

Steve Nocera, chairman

Sarah Koeniger, assessor's aide, secretary. David Gardner, assessor, entered and left the meeting several times, speaking only during Dr. Finn's appeal and when meeting briefly with Mr. Nocera after the last appellant had left.

Meetings were held in the Main Meeting Room, here at Town Hall.

Steve Nocera was the only Board member present.

First Appellant:

Jo Nol and Nancy Humphreys, 59 Woodchuck Hill Road. Met from 1:00 until 1:10

Appellants appealed the value of their real estate at 55 Woodchuck Hill Road. They stated on their application for appeal the building was not habitable and was purchased for \$20,000. The assessor does not have a value on the building, but does have a land assessment of \$12,140.

Second Appellant:

Chestnut Hill Assoc. of Simsbury LLC, represented by John M. McCarthy, sole member, and Attorney Arnold C. Sholovitz. Met from 1:15 pm until 1:27 pm.

Real estate appeal for 690 Hopmeadow Street and their calculation of a 29% increase in taxes and assessment based on the "doings" of the assessor. They have had approvals from the Town of Simsbury and want to renovate the property starting in June or July of this year with a fifteen month start to finish estimate. They will receive tax abatement from the Town and tax credits due to being a historical building. Because the building was a bank and it is stipulated in the sale that the building may no longer be used as a bank, all property associated with the bank; vault, safes, security, drive-up ATMs etc. must be removed. Also, lead and asbestos must be removed and the roof repaired. They would like to turn this building, "the mansion", into seven residences and to build thirty-one to forty-one new units on the property. Mr. Nocera said he would present their information to the other Board members.

Third Appellant:

Khurran Bashir, 28 Oakwood Road. Met from 1:27 until 1:32

Mr. Bashir feels that the assessment on his real estate is higher than other properties on his street. He used 71 Winthrop Street, in Tariffville, as an example of the house most like his.

While the houses on the street used for comparison are not the same style, he offered these as comparison, 19 and 20 Oakwood. Mr. Nocero said he would present his information to the other Board members.

Fourth Appellant:

Dr. Kenneth Finn, Dr. Kenneth R Finn DMD LLC. Met from 1:42 until 1:55

Dr. Finn is appealing the 2015 grand list personal property assessment of his dental business located at 530 Hopmeadow Street. Dr. Finn did not file a declaration until February of 2016. He informed Mr. Nocera that this was due to a hand injury. It was explained to him that because he did not file, an estimated assessment was done based on previous filing and a 25% penalty imposed as stated on the front of the declaration. Dr. Finn wants the new filing information used and the removal of the 25% penalty. Mr. Nocera informed Dr. Finn that while the assessor may use the figures provided in February of this year, according to Connecticut state statute, the penalty would not be removed.

Fifth Appellant:

James Ray of 18 Tolland Circle. Met from 1:55 until 2:00

Mr. Ray appealed the assessment of the following motor vehicles registered in his and/or his wife's name:

2011 Toyota Camry with 114,000 miles. No condition issues  
2013 Corolla with 73,000 miles which was traded-in, recently  
2006 Honda Element with 192,000 miles, also traded-in.

Mr. Ray also appealed the assessment on his son, Michael's

2009 Toyota Corolla with 95,000 miles and condition issues.

Mr. Ray provided Kelley Blue Book values as guidelines. Mr. Nocera informed Mr. Ray that the assessor is bound by the values in the NADA guides but that mileage and condition would be taken into consideration when he and the rest of Board review his values.

Sixth Appellant:

Steven Swenson, 19 Lawton Drive. Met from 2:00 until 2:10

Steven Swenson was under the impression he was presenting information concerning the value of three vehicles for a partial refund of his July 2015 motor vehicle tax bill from the Town of Simsbury. Mr. Nocera informed Mr. Swenson that the Board would be reviewing the value for

the upcoming July 2016 bill and that he would have to have appealed last summer's bill at the September 2015 Board of Assessment Appeals.

Mr. Swenson is appealing the value on the following vehicles registered to him:

2003 Passatt with condition issues  
2007 Honda in good condition with 135,000 miles  
2009 Passatt with 150,000 miles

Mr. Swenson provided Kelley Blue Book trade-in values. Mr. Nocero told Mr. Swenson he would present his information to the Board.

Seventh Appellant:

2 Hopmeadow Street Realty Co LLC. Met from 2:18 until 2:23

The appellant, Mark Greenberg, was represented by Attorney T.J. Donohue

The appeal is for the value of the land on two lots, 1A and 1C. They feel the land should be assessed at \$80,000 per acre as "Industrial". Site plan and information was provided. Mr. Nocera told Mr. Donohue he will present this information to the Board.

Eighth Appellant:

Kenneth and Linda Scheinholz, 8 Owens Brook Circle. Met from 2:25 until 2:32

Mr. and Mrs. Scheinholz are appealing the value of three vehicles:

2002 Cadillac with 150,000 miles  
2003 Cadillac with 150,000 miles. ABS and CD player don't work.  
1992 Cadillac with \$157,000 miles. Body damage and broken radio

Mr. Nocera informed them he would review this information with the Board. The Scheinholzs were also informed of the "antique" plate statute of a \$500 assessment. They were directed to the CT DMV website for more information on obtaining "antique" plates.

Ninth Appellant:

Maria Adams, 4 Green Valley Drive. Met from 2:32 until 2:47

Ms. Adams is appealing the "taxes" on her real estate versus those of her neighbors. An excel spread sheet was presented to Mr. Nocera. Because she was looking at taxes, she did not realize that some of her neighbors had similar assessments but could be receiving benefits through the Town of Simsbury through various programs which would reduce the tax. In

looking at the assessment of her property, she thought she was being taxed for a small shed as “outbuilding” when it was a gunite pool and patio. Mr. Nocera told Ms. Adams her information would be reviewed by the Board.

Tenth Appellant:

Neil Vayda, 118 Old Canal Way. Met from 2:47 until 2:52

Mr. Vayda is appealing the real estate assessment on his property in comparison with his neighbors. He provided Mr. Nocera with several comparisons in his neighborhood. Mr. Nocera told Mr. Vayda he would present this information to the Board.

Eleventh Appellant:

Robert Schultz, 15 Ruthie’s Lane. Met from 3:01 until 3:03

Mr. Schultz was appealing the value placed by the assessor on his barn. He was under the impression the barn was assessed at \$61,000 when it was actually valued at \$30,395. He had taken the total of all “outbuildings” on the property as being only for the barn which had cost him around \$38,000 in 2006. Mr. Schultz was satisfied to learn this was the case.

Twelfth Appellant:

Michael Medeiros, 28 Riverside Road. Met from 3:12 until 3:17

Mr. Medeiros is appealing the value of his garage. In his opinion it should be around \$15,000 and not \$41,703. Mr. Nocera inquired, as Mr. Medeiros is a builder, what it would cost to build this garage on a client’s property. He estimated between \$40,000 and \$50,000. Mr. Nocera said he would present his information to the Board.

Thirteenth Appellant

Alison Ashmore, Ashmore Hair Design. Met from 3:18 until 3:25

Ms. Ashmore, accompanied by her mother, is appealing the personal property assessment of her business. She did not file a personal property declaration for the 2015 grand list so the assessor’s office estimated a value based on similar businesses in town and added the 25% penalty in accordance with state statute. Ms. Ashmore filed a declaration and provided additional information in writing to Mr. Nocera. He informed Ms. Ashmore the new figures would be taken into consideration but that the penalty would not be waived.

Mr. Nocera informed each appellant at the close of each meeting, he or she would be notified by mail of the Board’s decision.