



**Town of Woodbridge  
Board of Assessment Appeals  
October 1, 2024 Grand List  
Special Meeting Minutes  
Friday, March 28, 2025 at 4 pm  
Town Hall – Main Meeting Room**

**Board of Assessment Members Present:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg Esq., Andrew Schaffer, Esq., Lin Yang

- The scheduled Board of Assessment Appeals appointments listed below took place. Each Board member reviewed appeal applications with appellants.
- Following the completion of all Hearings, the Board deliberated. Decisions are noted below.
- At 7:30 pm, Chair Ginzberg opened the meeting of the Woodbridge Board of Assessment Appeals.

**Appeals Heard by Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg:**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 101** property appeal. Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 101**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

- (1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.
- (2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to

the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 102** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 102**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 103** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 103**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the

basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 104** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 104**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 105** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 105**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 106** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 106**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates

rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.  
Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 202** property appeal.  
Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 202**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 203** property appeal.  
Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 203**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 204** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 204**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 205** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 205**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 206** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 206**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates

rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.  
Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 402** property appeal.  
Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 402**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 406** property appeal.  
Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 406**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:



(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 501** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 501**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 502** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 502**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision

shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 503** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 503**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 505** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 505**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Suite 506** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Suite 506**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates

rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.  
Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Building 700** property appeal.  
Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Building 700**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Chair Ginzberg moved to open discussion on the **1 Bradley Road, Building 900** property appeal.  
Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: OP Inc.** (Bruce Schaefer and Alex Schaefer)

**Property Location: 1 Bradley Road, Building 900**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Chair Ginzberg was reviewed and discussed with the Board. Appellant requested that all appeals of all units relating to the Woodbridge Office Park Buildings 100, 200, 400, 500, 700, and 900 are based on the same rationale and should be heard all at once, rather than one by one. The same decision shall apply to each appeal. The appeal cited two bases. The appellant requested that: (1) Buildings 700 and 900 be assessed on a per-unit basis (rather than per building) to be consistent with the assessment of other comparable units at the Woodbridge Office Park; and (2) All OP Inc. owned Woodbridge Office Park units not exceed \$100/sq. ft. to align with market conditions and comparable properties.

**Motion:** Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg motioned to deny the appeal. In summary, the appeal was denied on the basis that:

(1) In the 2019 revaluation, the appellant did not disagree with the methodology of assessing Buildings 700 and 900 as single buildings which resulted in a lower appraisal value benefiting the appellant, and the appellant filed Buildings 700 and 900 as buildings (rather than units) which the Town considered as the correct financial information when computing valuations.

(2) The comps provided did not substantiate a reduction. Comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property. Factors such as size, rents, vacancy rates, and different capitalization rates rendered the comps provided dissimilar to the subject property. See decision in the file.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

#### **Appeals Heard by Board Member Andrew Schaffer:**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **24 Lorraine Drive** property appeal.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Lawrence Lipsher**

**Property Location: 24 Lorraine Drive**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Andrew Schaffer was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to deny the appeal on the basis that the information provided by the appellant was subjective, anecdotal, and unpersuasive opinion without sufficient facts.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **15 Vernon Court** property appeal.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Gail Markiewicz**

**Property Location: 15 Vernon Court**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Andrew Schaffer was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to reduce the building assessment on the basis that the second building is a workshop without heat and it is not a livable space. Also, there is a neighbor blight situation that is negatively impacting the value of the subject property.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: Change net assessment to \$595,000 (from \$620,410).**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **34 Country Club Drive** property appeal.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Weiming Ni**

**Property Location: 34 Country Club Drive**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal

heard by Andrew Schaffer was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to deny the appeal on the basis that the information provided by the appellant was subjective, anecdotal, and unpersuasive opinion without sufficient facts.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **823 Fountain Street** property appeal.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Helaine Clara E. Munoz** (Representative: Richard Spear)

**Property Location: 823 Fountain Street**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Andrew Schaffer was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to reduce the building assessment by \$25,000 on the basis of the building condition.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: Change net assessment to \$270,470 (from \$295,470).**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **135 Rimmon Road** property appeal.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Richard Spear**

**Property Location: 135 Rimmon Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Andrew Schaffer was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to take no action on the appeal because the appellant claims he gave away his property last week and he no longer owns the house.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **825 Fountain Street** property appeal.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Richard Spear**

**Property Location: 825 Fountain Street**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Andrew Schaffer was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to reduce the building assessment by \$25,000 on the basis of the building condition and the age of the house.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: Change net assessment to \$220,770 (from \$245,770).**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **36 Selden Street** property appeal.  
Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Dale A. Ayotte**

**Property Location: 36 Selden Street**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to deny the appeal on the basis the claimant failed to appear.  
Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **10 Rock Hill Road** property appeal.  
Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Jacqueline Bogdanoff** (Representative: Robert Bogdanoff)

**Property Location: 10 Rock Hill Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Andrew Schaffer was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion** Andrew Schaffer motioned to reduce the building assessment by \$25,000 on the basis of that the subject property has a pipeline easement as well as an easement for four other houses which creates increased traffic conditions that negatively impacts his home value.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: Change net assessment to \$587,000 (from \$612,000).**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **12 Hickory Road** property appeal.  
Ling Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Mario Alvino**

**Property Location: 12 Hickory Road**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to deny the appeal on the basis the claimant failed to appear.  
Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **24 Pease Road** property appeal.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: 24 Pease LLC** (Joseph Migani)

**Property Location: 24 Pease Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Andrew Schaffer was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion** Andrew Schaffer motioned to reduce the building assessment by \$25,000 on the basis of the age and condition of the subject property.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: Change net assessment to \$320,590 (from \$345,590).**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **39 Pease Road** property appeal.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Joseph Migani**

**Property Location: 39 Pease Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Andrew Schaffer was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion 1:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to reduce the building assessment by \$20,000 on the basis of the age and condition of the subject property.

Lin Yang seconded. Discussion ensued. Motion did not pass.

**Vote: Yes** - Andrew Schaffer

**No** - Lin Yang, Jeffrey Ginzberg

**Motion 2:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to reduce the building assessment by \$10,000 on the basis of the age and condition of the subject property.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: Change net assessment to \$279,730 (from \$289,730).**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **5 Lines Road** property appeal.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Joseph Migani**

**Property Location: 5 Lines Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced himself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Andrew Schaffer was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to reduce the building assessment by \$10,000 on the basis of the age and condition of the subject property.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: Change net assessment to \$423,930 (from \$433,930).**



**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **58 Lawrence Street** property appeal.  
Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Wayne Luciani**

**Property Location: 58 Lawrence Street**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to deny the appeal on the basis that the claimant failed to appear.  
Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **1798 Litchfield Tpke** property appeal.  
Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Wayne Luciani**

**Property Location: 1798 Litchfield Tpke**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to deny the appeal on the basis that the claimant failed to appear.  
Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **571 Amity Road** property appeal.  
Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Gabriel Ariyanayagam**

**Property Location: 571 Amity Road**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to deny the appeal on the basis that the claimant failed to appear.  
Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **47 Northrop Road** property appeal.  
Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Patrick & Nada McGovern --Cancelled**

**Property Location: 47 Northrop Road**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to deny the appeal on the basis the claimant failed to appear.  
Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer moved to open discussion on the **38 Center Road** property appeal.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Abul Fazal M. Salahuddin**

**Property Location: 38 Center Road**

**Motion:** Andrew Schaffer motioned to deny the appeal on the basis that the claimant failed to appear.

Lin Yang seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

#### **Appeals Heard by Board Member Lin Yang:**

**Motion:** Lin Yang moved to open discussion on the **9 N. Pease Road** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Lynne K. Rudich Family Trust** (Lynn Rudich, Trustee)

**Property Location: 9 N. Pease Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced herself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Lin Yang was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Lin Yang motioned to deny the appeal on the basis that the claimant's comps lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Lin Yang moved to open discussion on the **25 Peck Hill Road** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Mary M. Miller** (Represented by Attorney Mark Miller)

**Property Location: 25 Peck Hill Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced herself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Lin Yang was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Lin Yang motioned to deny the appeal on the basis that the comps provided lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Lin Yang moved to open discussion on the **41 Round Hill Road** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Vivan Y Kim 2010 Trust** (Represented by Attorney Karen Kravetz)

**Property Location: 41 Round Hill Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced herself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Lin Yang was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Lin Yang motioned to deny the appeal on the basis that the appellants comps lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Lin Yang moved to open discussion on the **4 N. Racebrook Road** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Joseph Dellacroce** (Represented by Attorney Karen Kravetz)

**Property Location: 4 N. Racebrook Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced herself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Lin Yang was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Lin Yang motioned to deny the appeal on the basis that the information provided by the appellant was subjective, anecdotal, and unpersuasive opinion without sufficient facts.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Lin Yang moved to open discussion on the **162 Newton Road** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Jeffrey & Tyra Rabel** (Represented by Attorney Karen Kravetz)

**Property Location: 162 Newton Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced herself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Lin Yang was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Lin Yang motioned to deny the appeal on the basis that the appellants comps lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Lin Yang moved to open discussion on the **14 Centerview Road** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Charyn & Robert Powers** (Represented by Attorney Karen Kravetz)

**Property Location: 14 Centerview Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced herself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Lin Yang was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Lin Yang motioned to deny the appeal on the basis that the appellants comps lacked sufficient similarity to the subject property.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Lin Yang moved to open discussion on the **9 Enoch Drive** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Enoch LLC** (Represented by Attorney Karen Kravetz)

**Property Location: 9 Enoch Drive**

It was noted that the Board member introduced herself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Lin Yang was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Lin Yang motioned to deny the appeal on the basis that the information provided by the appellant was subjective, anecdotal, and unpersuasive opinion without sufficient facts.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Lin Yang moved to open discussion on the **7 Fox Hill Road Road** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Christopher Dellacroce** (Represented by Attorney Karen Kravetz)

**Property Location: 7 Fox Hill Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced herself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Lin Yang was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Lin Yang motioned to table discussion for further review.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: Pending.**

**Motion:** Lin Yang moved to open discussion on the **71 Maplevale Drive** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: 71 Maplevale LLC** (Represented by Attorney Karen Kravetz)

**Property Location: 4 Redwood Lane**

It was noted that the Board member introduced herself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Lin Yang was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Lin Yang motioned to deny the appeal on the basis that the information provided by the appellant was subjective, anecdotal, and unpersuasive opinion without sufficient facts.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Lin Yang moved to open discussion on the **4 Redwood Lane** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Redwood LLC** (Represented by Attorney Karen Kravetz)

**Property Location: 4 Redwood Lane**

It was noted that the Board member introduced herself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Lin Yang was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Lin Yang motioned to deny the appeal on the basis that the claimant's comps, while similar, contain excessive adjustments.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: No change.**

**Motion:** Lin Yang moved to open discussion on the **16 Old Mill Road** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Old Mill Holdings LLC** (Represented by Attorney Karen Kravetz)

**Property Location: 16 Old Mill Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced herself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Lin Yang was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Lin Yang motioned to reduce the building by \$20,000 on the basis of size, age, and condition as well as convincing comps provided.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: Change net assessment to \$410,850 (from \$430,850).**

**Motion:** Lin Yang moved to open discussion on the **34 Ox Box Lane** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: 34 Ox Box LLC** (Represented by Attorney Karen Kravetz)

**Property Location: 34 Ox Box Lane**

It was noted that the Board member introduced herself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Lin Yang was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Lin Yang motioned to table discussion for further review.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: Pending.**

**Motion:** Lin Yang moved to open discussion on the **118 Ford Road** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Michael Savino** (Represented by Gennaro Savino)

**Property Location: 118 Ford Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced herself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Lin Yang was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Lin Yang motioned to table discussion for further review.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: Pending.**

**Motion:** Lin Yang moved to open discussion on the **128 Ford Road** property appeal.

Jeffrey Ginzberg seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: Loise V Savino Family Trust** (Gennaro Savino, Trustee)

**Property Location: 128 Ford Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced herself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Lin Yang was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Lin Yang motioned to table discussion for further review.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: Pending.**

**Motion:** Lin Yang moved to open discussion on the **20 Newton Road** property appeal.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Appellant: First Church of Christ** (Roger Calistro & Kathleen Foster)

**Property Location: 20 Newton Road**

It was noted that the Board member introduced herself and the appellant was sworn in. The appeal heard by Lin Yang was reviewed and discussed with the Board.

**Motion:** Lin Yang motioned to table discussion for further review.

Andrew Schaffer seconded. Motion unanimously passed.

**Vote: Yes** - Chair Jeffrey Ginzberg, Andrew Schaffer, Lin Yang

**Board Decision: Pending.**

Respectfully submitted: *Toni Belenski*