

Norwich Town Clerk

From: Gered Dunne <gereddunne@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2026 12:11 PM
To: Norwich Town Clerk; Miranda Bergmeier; Listers
Subject: appeal to civil authority, public records request

Hi Lilly,

Please submit to the appropriate authority an appeal of our appeal of the Norwich Listers recent re-categorization of our home to an in-the-village tax rate, for all reasons listed in our initial appeal and outlined below. Our home is not in the village of Norwich for numerous reasons listed in our original letter of appeal to the listers. In our denial letter from the Norwich listers office we did not receive any explanation of why a denial decision was made, or any clarification on the criteria used to inform their denial of our appeal. As such:

Pursuant to the Vermont Public Records Act (1 V.S.A. §§ 315–320) I am also asking the Listers office to provide, first, the criteria they used to inform their decision making regarding the walkability of our home in Norwich, second, records showing how those criteria may have been applied in making the determination to move our home to "in-town walkable," third, if the Norwich Fire District boundaries are the primary justification for their determination, for the Listers office to provide the specific guidance from the Norwich Fire District chartering process that indicates that the boundaries of this district were delineated based on walkability, and fourth, the records showing that the decision making process in assessing the walkability of all homes that were changed from town adjacent to in-town walkable.

I will also provide you with this request in person later today.

Thank you,
Gered Dunne
62 Union Village Rd

Our initial appeals letter:

July 9, 2026

Town of Norwich Listers
Town of Norwich
Norwich, Vermont

Re: Property Assessment Grievance
Property Owner: Brooke Blicher and Gered Dunne
Property Address: 62 Union Village Road
Subject: Grievance of Land Valuation and Neighborhood Code Reassignment

Dear Members of the Board of Listers,

We respectfully submit this grievance regarding the land valuation and neighborhood code reassignment applied to our property. Our grievance concerns the recent change to the neighborhood code used in the land

valuation process, which resulted in an approximately \$120,000 increase in the assessed value of our property.

We believe this increase is unsupported, inequitable, and the result of an inconsistent post-reappraisal change to the neighborhood designation originally established by KRT, the reappraisal firm hired by the Town of Norwich. We are requesting that the Town restore the neighborhood code and land valuation recommended by KRT, or otherwise provide a documented, objective, and uniformly applied methodology supporting the change.

Summary of Grievance

Our household supports in full all points made in the grievance submitted by Brian and Molly Riordan of 59 Union Village Rd and the Norwich listers should also consider them our own.

In addition, we also choose to highlight most importantly the lack of professionalism and the inconsistency in the appraisal and reappraisal processes these past few years. Townwide survey work done by KRT has been deemed to be “filled with errors” by the current Norwich Listers, who are elected officials and not trained in the art of the craft. This makes no sense. Additionally, Norwich Listers cannot provide a list of what specific errors were made in relation to our property, nor can they provide a set of criteria used to determine how our home was moved from out-of town to in-town and walkable. Assessments of “walkability” are done using known and clear criteria, which a professional firm like KRT uses and surely the Norwich Listers did not, as they cannot provide it.

We ask the Norwich Listers, using whatever subjective and mysterious criteria relied upon in their redesignation of our home, to answer the following questions:

1. Did our home get closer to curbed sidewalks that provide safe walkable space for pedestrian use?
2. Does our roadway contain a wide enough shoulder upon which to safely walk outside of the flow of traffic?
3. Is our roadway shallow enough for a handicapped walker or wheelchair user to descend to town?
4. Is there a new curb-cut allowing wheelchairs to access the sidewalk at Turnpike Rd and Main Street?
5. Did our home become closer to a mass transit station (this is a MAJOR component of assessing an area’s walkability)?
6. Have steps been made to make our stretch of roadway safer in terms of the speeds that motor vehicles can travel (for example, have shoulders been widened, is there a demonstrable increase in policing of speed violations)?
7. Are there new traffic calming measures in place like crosswalks, crosswalk signage, curbs, speed humps, rumble strips in place along our stretch of roadway?
8. Are the speeds cars travel on our roadway similar to those of other re-designated ‘in-town’ roadways?
9. If, as we assume, “the fire district boundary” or the “village center boundary” were used as criteria to reassign “walkability,” is there evidence that shows that these boundaries were established based on any sort of “walkability” criteria?
10. Were all homes within these reassigned using these “criteria,” making the criteria consistently applied?

If any of your answers are “NO” to these questions, please seriously consider our appeal to your reassessment to be valid on both commonsense and tautological grounds. Should the answers change to “YES” then by all means, go ahead and hire a professional firm to redo the work of the original firm that the Norwich Listers have hired.

Respectfully submitted,

Gered Dunne

Brooke Blicher

62 Union Village Rd Norwich, VT 05055