



**TOWN OF NEWTOWN**  
OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR

**BOARD OF ASSESSMENT APPEALS**  
**MINUTES**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
**MARCH 10, 2007 @ 9:00 AM**  
**45 MAIN STREET**  
**NEWTOWN, CT 06470**

**PRESENT: CHARLES V. FRAMULARO, JR AND MARIANNE BROWN**  
**ALSO PRESENT: THOMAS DENOTO**

---

**1. Kenneth Swain, (MV)**

- Mr. Swain has a 1962 MGA assessed at \$8,960. He bought the vehicle for \$900, and it was not running when he bought it. The car is not on the road he is just restoring it. He stated that he registered the car in order to test the car on the road after he makes alterations. Brought in pictures showing the condition of the car. The paint is faded, bad seats, no side curtains, headlights are broken, and has wire wheels. Brought in a statement from Hemmings Motor News which sells antique automobiles and it had a 1958 MGA for \$3,500. In addition, he had a letter from his insurance company stating that the value of the car does not exceed \$5,000. Mr. Swain believed the car should be assessed at \$3,000.
- **Approved:** Assessment was reduced to \$3,000 at 100% value. New assessment is \$2,100 at 70% value. For 2005 Supple MV.

**2. Scott Lindsay, (MV)**

- Mr. Lindsay has a 2002 Oldsmobile van assessed at \$10,190. Mr. Lindsay believes the assessment should be reduced due to high mileage and condition. He bought the van from his mother and father for \$3,000. Brought in a mileage statement with the odometer reading at 121,000 miles. Board members inspected the car and found a few dents and scratches.
- **Approved:** Assessment was reduced by \$1,991 due to high mileage which resulted in an assessment of \$8,199 at 70% value. Car was registered in June which obligates tax payer to pay 33.3% of assessment which results in a net assessment of \$2,730 for the 2005 Supple MV.

### **3. John Hastedt, (RE), 11 Sand Hill Road**

- Mr. Hastedt has a 2 car garage with a finished room above assessed at \$61,700. He built the garage himself and it cost approximately \$45,000 to build. Mr. Hastedt stated he only uses the room as work space. The room has no plumbing, kitchen, or closet space. On the field card the garage is listed as a one family ranch which he states is incorrect due to the fact that it is an outbuilding. Also, he disagrees with the room configurations. Mr. Hastedt said the square footage of the room is roughly 507 square feet not 608 which is listed on the field card. Garage is also listed at 26 x 26 with .75 story height. He agrees with the dimensions, but he believes the story height is listed incorrectly and it should be lower. Mr. Hastedt also brought in two comparables. On High Rock Road there is a 2 car garage with finished quarters above, and a 1 car garage attached to it assessed at \$38,210. Also, on Queen Street there was also a 2 car garage with finished quarters above assessed at \$14,500. Mr. Hastedt believes the assessment is greater than what the garage is worth.
- **Approved:** The story height for the garage was changed from .75 to .65. The functional depreciation was changed from 25% to 35% due to the fact that the garage does not have all the amenities to designate it as living space. Square footage was also changed to 507 square feet from 608 square feet. Regarding the garage being listed as a one family ranch there is nothing the Assessor's Office can do to change that because they do not have a listing on the field cards for a garage with finished room above. By having the garage listed as a one family ranch does not add or remove value. From all other changes made assessment of the garage was reduced to \$53,480. This also changes assessment of property from \$302,200 to \$296,440.

### **4. John Estores, (RE)**

- Appointment Canceled

### **5. Paul Jaros, (RE), 2 Deer Trail**

- Mr. Jaros believes his property assessment is too high due to his addition being assessed at 100% complete for the 2006 Grand List. The property is assessed at \$206,350. The addition is not completed, and Mr. Jaros is unable to get a Certificate of Occupancy (C.O.) from the building department. The Building Department states that the interior of the addition still needs a lot of work.
- **Approved:** Addition is going to stay at 100% complete for the 2006 Grand List, but the functional depreciation was changed from 4% to 9%. This reduced the assessment from \$206,350 to \$195,970.

### **6. Joseph Paccia, (RE), 47 Head of Meadow Road**

- Mr. Paccia disagrees with his property assessment of \$239,460 due to discrepancies he has with the land. He has 2.7 acres, but he stated that most of it is wetlands. Mr. Paccia also said that part of the property is also sloped. Therefore, the land is unusable and if he ever wanted to expand on the house he would be unable to do so. Mr. Paccia believes the property should be assessed at \$190,000.

- **Denied:** Board of Assessment Appeals deliberated and found the property assessment to be fair and reasonable after reviewing the property and one's similar to it.

**7. Derek and Janice Bateson, (RE), 11 Merlins Lane**

- Mr. and Mrs. Bateson disagree with their property assessment of \$360,000 at 75% complete. The house is still under construction. The Board of Education applies an education levy to all new construction past 120 days. Since the Batesons house has been under construction for more than 120 days they have to pay an additional fee of \$136 a month for both of their children to attend Newtown schools. The Batesons feel since they have to pay an additional fee to the Board of Education that their property assessment should be reduced. Their reasoning for this is that the quality of our school systems influences how houses are assessed in Newtown. The Batesons believe their property assessment should be \$132,131.
- **Denied:** The Board of Assessment Appeals decided to keep the property assessment of \$360,000 at 75% complete. They stated that the Batesons need to appeal to the Board of Education since their issue is with them regarding the education levy.

**8. David Rizzardi, (PP), David Rizzardi Co. Inc.**

- Mr. Rizzardi disagrees with his personal property assessment of \$211,780. The Assessor found undeclared machinery on various properties owned by Mr. Rizzardi and added them to his personal property declaration. Mr. Rizzardi only disagrees with the machinery assessment of \$210,000. He stated that not all of the machinery is his, and that all the rest of his machinery he parks at Kovac's in Brookfield. The only time his machines are in Newtown is when he is working on a job. He stated that he should be dealing with Brookfield not Newtown, and therefore disagrees with his personal property assessment.
- **Denied:** The Board of Assessment Appeals decided that Mr. Rizzardi has to prove to Newtown where his machinery is located in order to adjust his personal property. They stated the burden of proof is on the taxpayer.

**9. Peter Campbell, (PP)**

- No Show

**10. Michael Stern, (PP)**

- Appointment Canceled

**11. Satyam Corporation, (PP), Mobile on Church Hill Road**

- Satyam Corp. appealed their personal property audit. The audit company G & K Associates came up with a personal property assessment of \$313,324. Satyam disagrees with the assessment due to the fact that the equipment is not distributed based on ownership. Satyam leases equipment from GE, Net Bank, Montana, Hood, and J. Polep. In addition, the tanks are not priced appropriately according to the contract from the company that installed them. Attorney Hall

came up with an assessment of \$105,798 after distributing assets based on ownership.

- **Undecided:** Pending calculation until Attorney Hall and G & K Associates resolve assessment discrepancies.