

MINUTES

2013 Board of Equalization and Review

May 16, 2013

Board Members Present: Jane Sparks, Chair
Jennifer Marsh
Bronwyn Merritt

Staff Members Present: Roger Gunn, Chief Appraiser
Steve Hensley, Appraiser
Scherri McCray, Recording Secretary

Ms. Sparks called the Board to order at 2:00 p.m. on Thursday May 16, 2013.

Patricia B. Kasdorf

PIN # 9767820712

Mr. & Mrs. Kasdorf appeared before the Board to appeal the valuation of their property located at 1515 MILL VALLEY ROAD, CHAPEL HILL. The current tax value assigned to the property by Orange County is \$755, 200. The appellants are requesting that the value be adjusted to \$ 689,000 based on the completion status of the basement. Mr. Kasdorf submitted two appraisal and photographs of the basement for the Board to review. One appraisal was from 2004 during preconstruction and the other was for 2009 which show the basement at approximately 10% completed. The appellant received a revaluation notice after obtaining a permit for the finishing the basement. He stated that the basement is not totally finished. When asked by the Board about the current percentage of completion, the appellant responded that it was 30%- 40% complete. The photographs that were presented by the appellant revealed the unfinished condition of the basement. In 2010, heating and cooling was added to the area. Mr. Kasdorf claims that homes were selling in his neighborhood for significantly lower than what they were valued.

The County explained that the calculation for the assessed values are based on what the property would have been worth, in its current condition, in 2009. Additionally, the County explained that the schedule of values were set and approved by the Board of County Commissioners for 2009 and the appellant's value changed due to the permit taken out. Upon review of the appraisal submitted by the appellant, the County suspects that the appraiser counted the vaulted ceiling as additional square footage.

When the County reviewed the subject, it was determined that the subject was not measured correctly. The County requested that the Board allow them to conduct a field review to obtain a correct measurement of the subject. The County explained that due to the conversion from the County's former appraisal system to the current system, the County was not able to accurately account for all finished area. The County would like to measure the outside of the subject and review the completion status of the basement area. The County informed the appellant that the value will change when new permits are obtained and at the time of the full completion of the basement area.

Ms. Sparks made a motion to allow the County to conduct a field review to ascertain the correct measurements for the subject. The County's findings shall be brought back before the Board for review. Mrs. Marsh seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Ayes: 3
Noes: 0

Jack Marcheschi

PIN # 9870707913

Mr. Marcheschi appeared before the Board to appeal the valuation of his property located at 8514 SEAWELL SCHOOL ROAD, CHAPEL HILL. The current tax value assigned to the property by Orange County is \$ 360,441. This property was built in 1990 and purchased in 1994 for \$ 192,000. The appellant is requesting a reduction in value based on the conditions placed on the land by OWASA and Duke Power. Mr. Marcheschi claims that in 1990, he was forced to sell a 40 feet x 180 feet easement to OWASA for \$25,000. This easement was needed for the construction of the Homestead subdivision. He said that he did not want to sell them this easement but he was told that that if he did not sell them the easement, this property was going to be flooded by the water runoff from the subdivision. Mr. Marcheschi added that when he first purchased his house, he had a private gravel driveway, but since then he has had to share this driveway with his neighbors, and he claims he is the only one that maintains it. Furthermore, Duke Power has power lines running through the back of his property. He referenced a newer property that sold in his neighborhood that he felt was comparable to his property. The property is 8510 Seawell School Road; it was built in 2001 and sold for \$ 240,000 in May 2011. Mr. Marcheschi told the Board that he doesn't feel that his house is worth more than his neighbor's house because their house is newer construction with additional amenities that his house does not have. He pointed out that the only other difference between these two properties is the lot sizes.

The County reviewed the comparable that the appellant submitted. The County was not able to identify the other sales that the appellant referenced. The County made a recommendation that the land value be reduced by 20 % to compensate for the easement and power lines.

The Board reviewed all documentation presented by the appellant and the County. After deliberation, Ms. Sparks made a motion to accept the County's recommendation to adjust the land value down to \$ 109,300. This would make the total assessed value of the property \$ 333,000. Ms. Merritt seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Ayes: 3
Noes: 0

Jeffery J. Wiebe

PIN # 9854077601

Mr. Wiebe appeared before the Board to appeal the valuation of his property located at 3320 SOUTHERN DRIVE, EFLAND. The current tax value assigned to the property by Orange County is

\$ 137,100. He is requesting that the Board adjust his value to \$ 99,000 due to an appraisal that suggested a lower amount. He believes that an error was made on the appraisal when the house was being reconstructed. The appellant told the Board that he had purchased the lot and relocated a duplex structure that was originally built in 1975 to the property. In 2010, the structure was renovated and put on the market for \$120,000 to which there were no offers to buy the property. Mr. Wiebe also suspects that the square footage on the appraisal is incorrect.

Upon review, the County stated that the structural dimensions cited on the appellant's appraisal were approximately the same as the County's records. The County also verified that the structure was built in 1975 and noted there was 12 % physical depreciation on the building. The County recommended increasing depreciation from 28 % to 30 % for physical depreciation.

During deliberation, the Board reviewed all the documentation and information presented by the appellant and the County. After deliberation, Ms. Sparks made a motion to accept the recommendation made by the County to adjust the depreciation on the house to 25% to which Ms. Merritt counter motioned that the depreciation should be adjusted to 28%. Ms. Sparks conceded and seconded Ms. Merritt's motion and the motion carried.

Ayes: 3
Noes: 0

Donna G. Underwood

PIN # 9893014127

Ms. Underwood elected not to appear before the Board and requested to allow the appeal form and all supporting documentation to serve as her appeal. The property is located at 4010 OLD NC 10, DURHAM. The current tax value assigned to the property by Orange County is \$239,600. The appellant is requesting a reduction in value based on an appraisal that suggested a value of \$ 153,000.

Upon review, the County noted that the appellant had filed a prior appeal and as a result of that appeal, the property value increased. The County stated that there was a discrepancy with the sketch of the attached garage and recommended that it should be changed to a carport. The County added that there was already 60% depreciation on the house. The house is currently valued at \$ 44,800 which is a decrease from \$ 114,400 and the land value is \$ 143,700 down from \$ 204,300. The new value is \$ 238,700. These reductions reflect the changes that were made after the informal appeal.

During deliberation, the Board reviewed all documentation presented by the appellant and the County. The Board noted that there were other outside structures on the property that had value. After deliberation, Ms. Merritt made a motion to place a zero value on the two outside yard items and to accept the County's recommendation to correct the record to reflect a carport. The adjusted total value of the property will be \$ 233,900. Mrs. Marsh seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Ayes: 3
Noes: 0

Donna G. Underwood

PIN # 9896783023

Ms. Underwood elected not to appear before the Board and requested to allow the appeal form and all supporting documentation to serve as her appeal. The property is located at 6306 SCHLEY ROAD, HILLSBOROUGH. The current tax value assigned to the property by Orange County is \$349,000. She is requesting that the Board reduce the value to \$ 210,000 based on an appraisal that suggested the reduced value of the property.

Upon review, the County noted that there was a building that was not recorded on the property record card. The County added that building to the records and corrected the length of a building during the informal appeal. The County stated that the house has a grade of C+10.

The Board reviewed all documents presented by the appellant and the County. After deliberation, Mrs. Marsh made a motion that no change be made to the County's current assessed value due to the lack of substantial evidence proving this assessed value was incorrect. Ms. Sparks seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Ayes: 3

Noes: 0

Timothy D. Mastro

PIN # 9799716853

Pradhana Mastro appeared before the Board to appeal the valuation of her property located at 104 SHEFFIELD CIRCLE, CHAPEL HILL. The current tax value assigned to the property by Orange County is \$1,006,400. The appellant is requesting that the Board reduce the property value to \$ 808,000 based on a refinancing appraisal conducted in February 2013 that suggested this reduced amount. Mrs. Mastro states that her and her husband purchased this 3500 square foot residence, situated on a .7 acre parcel in April 2012 for \$ 960,000, and since the time of purchase, they have made approximately \$ 40,000 worth of renovations. Mrs. Mastro inquired as to why the value of their house was appraised lower than that of the County's value to which the Board proceeded to explain the revaluation process. The Board told the appellant that this increase in value was triggered when the appellant obtained the building permits for the renovation.

Upon review, the County noted that the measurement of the storage area was incorrect and that there were other discrepancies with the County's records. The County recommended that the square footage of the storage area be adjusted from 596 square feet to 300 square feet. The County also recommended the removal of a secondary wall and a construction modifier.

During deliberation, the Board reviewed all documentation presented by the appellant and the County. After deliberation, Ms. Sparks made a motion to accept the County's recommendation. Ms. Merritt seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Ayes: 3

Noes: 0

Michael Triplett

PIN # 9767401662

Mr. Triplett elected not to appear before the Board and requested to allow the appeal form and all supporting documentation to serve as his appeal. His property is located at 104 WOLF'S TRAIL, CHAPEL HILL. The current tax value assigned to the property by Orange County is \$370,364. The appellant is requesting that the current valuation be reduced by \$ 70,000 based on a September 2011 appraisal that suggested a lower amount. The appellant's document states that the tax value is too high and the he cannot sell the property for that amount.

The Board reviewed all documents presented by the appellant and the County. After deliberation, Ms. Sparks made a motion that no change be made to the current assessed value due to the lack of time relevant information from the revaluation period of January 1, 2009, and no evidence was provided to prove that the County's assessed value was incorrect. Mrs. Marsh seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Ayes: 3
Noes: 0

Ting Ting Chu

PIN # 9880427912

Mr. Chu elected not to appear before the Board and requested to allow the appeal form and all supporting documentation to serve as his appeal. His property is located at 119 BASSWOOD COURT, CHAPEL HILL. The current tax value assigned to the property by Orange County is \$447,200. The appellant received a decision notice from the Tax office in response to his informal appeal which initiated a Board appeal. The appellant is requesting that the Board reduce his property value to \$ 364,100 based upon a comparative market analysis conducted by his realtor. This analysis suggested that the market price of his property is \$ 364,100 on January 1, 2009. It also cited the average price of five comparable sales that occurred in 2008 for properties that are in close proximity to the subject.

Upon review, the County noted a discrepancy with the property record card. The subject has a deck that is not reflected on the property record card. The County recommends that the deck be added to the property record card.

The Board reviewed all information provided by the appellant and the County. After deliberation, the Board stated that the value per square foot of the subject was in range of price per square foot for similar properties in the appellant's area. Ms. Merritt made a motion to add the deck with a zero value change to the records. Ms. Sparks seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Ayes: 3
Noes: 0

Tonia M. Fearrington

PIN # 9836271793

Ms. Fearrington elected not to appear before the Board and requested to allow the appeal form and all supporting documentation to serve as her appeal. Her property is located at 1006 PALACE DRIVE, EFLAND. She is requesting a reduction to the land value only. The current tax value assigned to the property by Orange County is \$375,000. This value was reduced from \$ 391,500 after an informal appeal decision. Ms. Fearrington would like for her value to be further reduced to \$ 285,325 citing a comparative market analysis provided by her realtor that suggest this amount.

Upon review, the County stated that during the informal appeal, the land value was adjusted by 20% to reflect its shape and utility. The County noted that the property record card suggests a masonry exterior on all sides of the subject; however during the course of the field review, the County realized that the subject only had masonry on three sides. The County recommends that the design factor be adjusted to .03 for the main area, and the exterior wall be changed from masonry to frame.

During deliberation, the Board reviewed all documents presented by the appellant and the County. The Board stated that the sales comparables presented by the appellant were not in the relevant time frame of January 1, 2009. Ms. Marsh made a motion to accept the recommendation made by the County to change the exterior and design factor. These changes will adjust the value of the appellant's property to \$ 352,300. Ms. Merritt seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Ayes: 3
Noes: 0

Having heard all the appeals scheduled on this date, Ms. Sparks made a motion to adjourn this meeting. Ms. Merritt seconded the motion and the meeting was adjourned at 4:17 pm.



Jane Sparks, Chair



Scherri McCray, Recording Secretary