2013 Abatement Requests

| Map \& Lot | Owner | Address | Current <br> Assessment | Taxpayers Requested Assessment | Taxpayers Requested \$ Change | Assessor's Abatement Recommendation | Assessor's Revised Assessment | Assessor's <br> Recommended <br> \$ Change | Total Abatement Amount ${ }^{\star}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Various | Orion UNH LLC | Various |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-4-22 | Karl Van Asselt Liv Rev Trust | 17 Fairchild Drive | \$386,200 | \$335,000 | \$51,200 | GRANT | \$366,700 | \$19,500 | \$593.00 |
| 1-9-37 | Bradley Skotko \& Heather Smith | 2 Scotland Road | \$333,900 | \$280,000 | \$53,900 | GRANT | \$266,700 | \$67,200 | \$436.70 |
| 1-9-43 | Joann Githens | 1 Tom Hall Road | \$262,600 | \$214,400 | \$48,200 | GRANT | \$238,300 | \$24,300 | \$738.96 |
| 1-16-14 | Stephen \& Kimberly Nadeau | 18 Emerson Road | \$398,500 | \$375,000 | \$23,500 | GRANT | \$382,300 | \$16,200 | \$492.64 |
| 1-16-23(10) | Dianne Thompson | 22 Perley Lane | \$399,500 | \$353,000 | \$46,500 | GRANT | \$379,100 | \$20,400 | \$620.36 |
| 2-8-11 | Gangwer Properties | 35 Madbury Road | \$895,700 | \$780,000 | \$115,700 | GRANT | \$873,000 | \$22,700 | \$690.31 |
| 2-8-12 | Alpha Gamma Rho | 6 Strafford Ave. | \$1,003,600 | \$790,000 | \$213,600 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 2-9-1 | Mu Alpha Building Assoc | 11 Strafford Ave. | \$1,353,100 | \$907,300 | \$445,800 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 2-9-2 | Gamma Mu Alumni Assoc | 5 Strafford Ave. | \$975,000 | \$780,000 | \$195,000 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 2-11-2 | NH Beta Housing LLC | 28 Madbury Road | \$1,456,400 | \$930,000 | \$526,400 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 2-12-11 | Ionian Properties | 10 Pettee Brook Lane | \$3,793,700 | \$2,930,000 | \$863,700 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 2-14-4 | Town \& Campus Inc | 60 Main Street | \$1,716,100 | \$1,380,000 | \$336,100 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 3-1-11 | Golden Goose Properties LLC | 56 Madbury/Davis Court | \$3,889,200 | \$3,352,743 | \$536,457 | DENY | \$4,071,300 | \$0 | \$0.00 |
| 4-9-0 | Thomas Christie | 12 Jenkins Court | \$2,363,800 | \$1,725,574 | \$638,226 | GRANT | \$2,116,100 | \$247,700 | \$7,532.56 |
| 4-16-0 | SEJ Properties | 10 Madbury Road | \$872,700 | \$815,000 | \$57,700 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 4-29-0 | Jesse Gangwer | 46 Woodman Road | \$12,500 | not specified |  | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 4-41-4 | Jay Connor | 3 Bayview Road | \$168,500 | \$145,000 | \$23,500 | GRANT | \$148,500 | \$20,000 | \$680.20 |
| 5-1-5 | 37 Main Street LLC | 37 Main St. | \$2,380,900 | \$2,000,000 | \$380,900 | GRANT | \$2,209,500 | \$128,500 | \$3,907.69 |
| 5-2-1 | Arthur R.S. Klaeson III | 4A \& B Smith Park Lane | \$211,700 | \$175,000 | \$36,700 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 5-2-8 | Community Church of Durham | 17 Main Street | \$90,000 | \$0 | \$90,000 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 5-6-5 | Patricia Cusack Trust | 14-16 Old Landing Road | \$462,800 | \$375,000 | \$87,800 | GRANT | \$373,500 | \$89,300 | \$2,715.61 |
| 6-1-1 | PSNH | Mill Road | \$9,999,500 | not specified |  | NO ACTION |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 6-1-10 | Thomas Christie | 13 Foss Farm Road | \$190,200 | \$124,857 | \$65,343 | GRANT | \$169,000 | \$21,200 | \$644.69 |
| 6-2-14 | Helena \& Richard England | 18 Orchard Dr. | \$400,800 | \$356,712 | \$44,088 | GRANT | \$394,100 | \$6,700 | \$203.75 |
| 6-2-20 | Cicely Buckley | 20 Orchard Drive | \$107,400 | \$95,000 | \$12,400 | GRANT | \$91,700 | \$15,700 | \$477.44 |
| 6-6-22 | Daniel \& Kathleen Bean | 5 Valentine Hill Road | \$172,900 | \$150,000 | \$22,900 | GRANT | \$154,300 | \$18,600 | \$565.63 |
| 6-6-26 | Jonathan \& Hilary Babon | 14 Valentine Hill Road | \$258,200 | not specified |  | GRANT | \$195,400 | \$58,600 | \$1,782.03 |
| 6-7-4 | Peter J. Silverman | 52 Oyster River Road | \$91,400 | \$70,000 | \$21,400 | GRANT | \$71,100 | \$20,300 | \$617.32 |
| 6-13-0 | No. NE Telephone | McDaniel Drive | \$6,571,800 | not specified |  | NO ACTION |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 8-1-37 | Amy Boylan | 37 Pinecrest Lane | \$261,100 | \$244,200 | \$16,900 | WITHDRAWN |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 8-1-113 | Peter \& Tawny Halloran | 11 Cutts Road | \$299,400 | \$270,000 | \$29,400 | GRANT | \$288,100 | \$11,300 | \$343.63 |
| 8-1-114 | Steven Bornstein | 12 Cutts Rd. | \$302,000 | \$242,000 | \$60,000 | GRANT | \$243,200 | \$58,800 | \$1,788.11 |
| 9-8-2 | 277 Main LLC | 277 Main Street | \$4,724,402 | \$4,300,000 | \$424,402 | GRANT | \$4,594,700 | \$129,702 | \$3,944.24 |
| 10-7-1 | Paul Wiles | 30 Canney Road | \$361,200 | \$340,000 | \$21,200 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 10-8-5 | Ying Shi | 121 Dover Road | \$267,500 | \$254,500 | \$13,000 | GRANT | \$241,400 | \$26,100 | \$793.70 |
| 10-12-4 | Richard \& Jean Kearney | 19 Littlehale Road | \$243,500 | \$228,000 | \$15,500 | GRANT | \$236,900 | \$6,600 | \$200.71 |
| 10-20-3 | Denise Robbins | 34 Dover Road | \$262,400 | not specified |  | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 10-20-6 | John H. Bubar | 42 Dover Road | \$385,800 | \$344,568 | \$41,232 | GRANT | \$362,400 | \$23,400 | \$711.59 |
| 12-1-4 | J. Evette Sorbello LaGram | 36 Cedar Point Road | \$428,000 | not specified |  | GRANT | \$403,200 | \$24,800 | \$754.17 |
| 12-1-15 | Michael Cleary | 26 Cedar Point Road | \$566,300 | \$450,000 | \$116,300 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 12-1-20A | Mary T. \& Stephen P. Weglarz Jr. | 17 Cedar Point Road | \$129,600 | \$100,000 | \$29,600 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 12-1-23 | William \& Patricia Mabey | 16 Cedar Point Road | \$301,000 | \$200,000 | \$101,000 | GRANT | \$209,900 | \$91,100 | \$2,770.35 |
| 12-16-14 | Mildred Penhale Rev Trust | 15 Edgerly Garrison Roa | \$543,600 | \$440,000 | \$103,600 | GRANT | \$468,300 | \$75,300 | \$2,289.87 |
| 12-18-0 | Nancy Barrett Rev. Trust | 38 Colony Cove Road | \$338,200 | \$250,000 | \$88,200 | GRANT | \$300,000 | \$38,200 | \$1,161.66 |
| 12-20-0 | Benning Family Trust | 36 Colony Cove Road | \$516,200 | \$410,000 | \$106,200 | GRANT | \$489,100 | \$27,100 | \$824.11 |
| 12-23-1 | Bruce \& Diantha Barstow | 30 Colony Cove Road | \$534,800 | \$480,000 | \$54,800 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 12-24-1 | Sibylle Carlson | 26 Colony Cove Road | \$473,300 | \$450,000 | \$23,300 | GRANT | \$416,600 | \$56,700 | \$1,724.25 |


| 12-24-3 | Arthur \& Sharon Pierce | 24 Colony Cove Road | \$567,700 | \$475,000 | \$92,700 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12-25-0 | Kathleen Lohnes | 22 Colony Cove Road | \$641,100 | \$550,000 | \$91,100 | GRANT | \$595,000 | \$46,100 | 1,401.90 |
| 13-14-13 | Emershire LLC | 25 Worthen Road | \$13,629,200 | \$9,807,800 | \$3,821,400 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 14-8-8 | Sriram Bhat | 303 Packers Falls Road | \$342,200 | not specified |  | GRANT | \$340,400 | \$1,800 | \$54.74 |
| 14-37-0 | PSNH | Bennett Road | \$2,894,600 | not specified |  | NO ACTION |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 15-15-11 | Douglas \& Mary Bencks | 7 York Drive | \$397,900 | \$365,000 | \$32,900 | GRANT | \$384,700 | \$13,200 | \$401.41 |
| 15-25-0 | Thomas Christie | 45 Longmarsh Road | \$193,400 | not specified |  | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 16-4-32 | Sharad \& Manisha Aggarwal | 14 Sandy Brook Dr. | \$349,900 | not specified |  | GRANT | \$305,400 | \$44,500 | \$1,353.25 |
| 16-10-4 | Donna Heald McCosker | 220 Longmarsh Road | \$162,900 | not specified |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16-21-2 | Martin Mugar | 314 Durham Point Road | \$449,219 | not specified |  | WITHDRAWN |  |  |  |
| 16-30-0 | Winecellar Farm | 21 Winecellar Road | \$337,173 | \$230,000 | \$107,173 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 17-17-0 | Anh Pham | 191 Packers Falls Road | \$326,000 | \$203,350 | \$122,650 | GRANT | \$193,800 | \$132,200 | \$4,020.20 |
| 17-40-0 | Joseph \& Nancy Smath | 89 Packers Falls Road | \$362,200 | not specified |  | GRANT | \$346,800 | \$15,400 | \$468.31 |
| 18-3-1 | Lenk Rev Trust | 250 Newmarket Road | \$358,600 | not specified |  | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 18-18-5 | John \& Bernice Tozier Rev Trust | 8 Ross Road | \$371,200 | \$350,000 | \$21,200 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 18-19-1 | Ted \& Lynn Castonguay | 39 Stagecoach Road | \$543,700 | not specified |  | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 19-17-0 | Hakim \& Lindsey Belaidi | 406 Bay Road | \$497,000 | \$485,000 | \$12,000 | GRANT | \$479,300 | \$17,700 | \$538.26 |
| 20-3-1 | Frederick \& Elizabeth Bramante | 587 Bay Road | \$1,052,800 | \$850,000 | \$202,800 | GRANT | \$909,200 | \$143,600 | \$4,366.88 |
| 20-3-2-2B | England Family Ltd. Partnership | 573 Bay Road | \$919,252 | \$790,000 | \$129,252 | GRANT | \$862,642 | \$56,610 | \$1,721.51 |
| 20-3-5 | Jochen Meissner | 571 Bay Road | \$940,500 | \$800,000 | \$140,500 | GRANT | \$874,300 | \$66,200 | \$2,013.14 |
| 20-7-3 | Christopher \& Stefanie Daly | 551 Bay Road | \$1,255,441 | \$850,000 | \$405,441 | GRANT | \$1,107,141 | \$148,300 | \$4,509.80 |
| 20-8-5 | Daniel \& Sarah Ford | 433 Bay Road | \$760,863 | \$710,857 | \$50,006 | GRANT | \$714,716 | \$46,147 | \$1,403.33 |
| 20-9-3 | Elbert W. Kelley Jr. | 36 Adams Point Road | \$322,634 | \$250,000 | \$72,634 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
| 20-11-2 | deCampi Rev Trust | 55 Adams Point Road | \$1,366,102 | \$1,100,000 | \$266,102 | GRANT | \$1,113,498 | \$252,604 | \$7,681.57 |
| 20-12-1 | William Getchell | 295 Durham Point Road | \$649,700 | \$550,000 | \$99,700 | GRANT | \$522,900 | \$126,800 | \$3,855.99 |
| 20-14-2 | John \& Elizabeth Riley | 275 Durham Point Road | \$1,065,040 | not specified |  | GRANT | \$941,618 | \$123,531 | \$3,756.58 |
| 20-14-6 | Ralph Kleinmann (sold 1/21/14) | 273 Durham Point Road | \$974,768 | \$875,000 | \$99,768 | GRANT | \$824,911 | \$149,857 | \$3,695.74 |
| 20-16-2 | Ralph Kleinmann | 269 Durham Point Road | \$311,900 | \$250,000 | \$61,900 | GRANT | \$291,100 | \$20,800 | \$632.53 |
| 20-16-3 | Ralph Kleinmann | 267 Durham Point Road | \$505,100 | \$443,300 | \$61,800 | GRANT | \$494,800 | \$10,300 | \$313.22 |
| 22-27-0 | Kang Wu \& Yuan Zhao | 5 Surrey Lane | \$419,600 | \$375,000 | \$44,600 | GRANT | \$366,900 | \$52,700 | \$891.31 |
| 99-320 | Northern Utilities |  | \$6,190,400 | \$2,614,351 | \$3,576,049 | DENY |  |  | \$0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Totals: | \$91,314,994 | \$51,367,512 | \$15,693,323 |  | \$32,423,526 | \$2,834,351 | \$83,084.95 |

*Abatement amounts do not include interest at 6\% per annum from date paid to refund date per RSA 76-17-a.
*Abatements highlighted in red are the assessor's recommendations being brought forward for current Council meeting.
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## ABATEMENT RECOMMENDATION

DATE: July 24, 2014
TOWN OF: Durham
TO: Town Council
FROM: Jim Rice, CNHA
OWNER: Town \& Campus, Inc. 60 Main Street Durham, NH 03824

REPRESENTATIVE: N/A
PROPERTY LOCATION: 60 Main Street, Durham, NH 03824
PID: 02-14-4
PROPERTY TAX YEAR APPEALED: 2013
APPLICATION FILING DATE W/MUNICIPALITY: February 26, 2014 (Filing deadline is $3 / 3 / 2014$ due to holiday)

INVENTORY FILING DATE (Filing Date April $15^{\text {th }}$ ): N/A
ASSESSMENT APPEALED: $\$ 1,716,100.00$
Municipalities may abate taxes "for good cause shown." RSA 76:16. Good cause is generally established by showing an error in the assessment calculation or a disproportionate assessment. Good cause can also be established by showing poverty and inability to pay the tax. If the abatement application is based on disproportionate assessment, the taxpayer has the burden to show how the assessment was disproportionate. To carry this burden the taxpayer must show:
a. What the property was worth (market value) on the assessment date.
b. The property's "equalized assessment" exceeded the property's market value. To calculate the equalized assessment, simply divide the assessment by the municipality's equalization ratio (assessment $\div$ ratio). Because a property's market value is a crucial issue, taxpayers must have an opinion of the market value estimate. Obtaining an appraisal or presenting sales of comparable properties can show this value estimate.

REASON(S) FOR APPEAL: The taxpayers assessment increased from $\$ 1,503,400$ to $\$ 1,716,100$ as a result of the 2013 statistical update. The taxpayer is appealing his assessment based on an appraisal that estimated the market value to be $\$ 1,380,000$ as of $4 / 1 / 13$. The intended use of the appraisal was to establish a "retrospective" (estimate of market value as of a historical date) market value of the property for tax abatement purposes.

ASSESSOR'S COMMENTS: Briefly, the subject property is a 0.35 acre parcel of land located on the corner of Main Street and Jenkins Court that has been improved with mixed-use buildings. The building was constructed circa 1920 with several additions and renovations over the years. At the present time, the various buildings are divided into five commercial units and six student apartments on the second floor. The largest unit, Town \& Campus is owner occupied. Due to the many renovations and/or additions, the commercial units do not have good floor plans and are functionally obsolete. Overall, the buildings are in below average condition. However, the location of the subject property is very desirable for a mixed use property.

Although the appraiser stated in his report that "as of the valuation date, the subject property was not listed for sale or was it under agreement", the owner indicated to me that he has signed a non-disclosure agreement with a prospective buyer for the property.

In the appraisal report, the appraiser estimated the market value of the subject property to be $\$ 1,380,000.00$. The appraiser's estimated value was based the following:

| Cost Approach: | N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Income Approach: | $\$ 1,375,000$ |
| Sales Comparison Approach: | $\$ 1,380,000$ |
| Site Value (As if Vacant): | $\$ 1,165,000$ |

When reviewing the appraisal report, the appraiser indicated that the market trend for Durham, Dover and Portsmouth showed declining values between July 2008 to June 2009 of 12\%. From June 2009 to the end of 2011, property values declined $3 \%$ annually. From 2012 to the present, market values increased 3\% annually. I find this to be untrue of Durham. Between 2008 and 2012, property values overall increased approximately $5.7 \%$. Therefore, using the same comparables as the appraiser would have indicated an estimated site value (as if vacant) for the subject property of $\$ 1,367,100$ as of $4 / 1 / 13$ (this estimated value does not include demolition costs).

A review of the Income Approach revealed that the appraiser underestimated the commercial rental space at $\$ 12.25 / \mathrm{sf}$ when according to his report, rents on Main Street and Jenkins Court are between $\$ 14-\$ 22 / \mathrm{sf}$. The appraiser also over-estimated the capitalization rate at $11.16 \%$. A more reasonable cap rate in Durham would have been approximately $10.15 \%$. A more reasonable estimate of market value utilizing the Income Approach would be approximately, $\$ 1,745,000$, which is complimented by the assessment (utilizing the Cost Approach) of $\$ 1,716,100$.

RECOMMENDATION: Based on the aforementioned information, I recommend the abatement request be denied.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please don't hesitate to contact me.





TOWN OF DURHAM
15 NEWMARKET ROAD
DURHAM, NH 03824-2898
Tel: 603/868-8064
Fax: 603/868-8033

## ABATEMENT RECOMMENDATION

DATE: July 21, 2014
TOWN OF: Durham
TO: Town Council
FROM: Jim Rice, CNHA
OWNER: Michael J. Cleary Revocable Trust 26 Cedar Point Road Durham, NH 03824

REPRESENTATIVE: N/A
PROPERTY LOCATION: 26 Cedar Point Road, Durham, NH 03824
PID: 12-1-15
PROPERTY TAX YEAR APPEALED: 2013
APPLICATION FILING DATE W/MUNICIPALITY: February 24, 2014 (Filing deadline is $3 / 3 / 2014$ due to holiday)

INVENTORY FILING DATE (Filing Date April $15^{\text {th }}$ ): N/A
ASSESSMENT APPEALED: $\$ 566,300.000$
Municipalities may abate taxes "for good cause shown." RSA 76:16. Good cause is generally established by showing an error in the assessment calculation or a disproportionate assessment. Good cause can also be established by showing poverty and inability to pay the tax. If the abatement application is based on disproportionate assessment, the taxpayer has the burden to show how the assessment was disproportionate. To carry this burden the taxpayer must show:
a. What the property was worth (market value) on the assessment date.
b. The property's "equalized assessment" exceeded the property's market value. To calculate the equalized assessment, simply divide the assessment by the municipality's equalization ratio (assessment $\div$ ratio). Because a property's market value is a crucial issue, taxpayers must have an opinion of the market value estimate. Obtaining an appraisal or presenting sales of comparable properties can show this value estimate.

REASON(S) FOR APPEAL: The taxpayer's assessment increased from $\$ 528,500$ to $\$ 566,300$ due to the 2013 statistical update. The taxpayer believes there is disproportionality regarding the assessment changes between waterfront and non-waterfront properties on Cedar Point Road, particularly the land portion of the assessment.

ASSESSOR'S COMMENTS: The subject property is comprised of 0.31 acre with 135 ' water frontage on Little Bay. The property has a $160+/$ - degree view of Little Bay with deep water access during low tide. Topography of the site is fairly level with road grade to behind the house, then drops sharply downward to Little Bay. Vegetation on the site is primarily an open lawn area with some foundation shrubs and flowering plants.

According to the assessment records, the original house was constructed 1964 as a ranch style house (see photos below). The owners purchased the property in 2004 for $\$ 485,000$. In 2009, 2010 \& 2013 building permits were issued to add a second story addition, add solar panels to the roof and construct a dock and landing. The new dock and landing will not be included in this abatement recommendation because they were constructed after 4/1/13. They will be added to the assessment for tax year 2014.

On 6/17/14, 7/14/14 and 7/18/14, phone messages and e-mails were left for the taxpayer to contact the assessor's office to conduct an inspection of the property regarding his abatement request. The taxpayer has been unresponsive.

RECOMMENDATION: Based on my exterior inspection of the property on $4 / 3 / 14$, I recommend the following adjustments to their assessment record card:

1) Adjust the dimensions of the deck, correcting the square footage from 601 sf to 685 sf .
2) Adjust the dimensions on the sketch, correcting the different story heights of the house.
3) Adjust interior wall covering from plywood panel to drywall.
4) Adjust the bathroom count from 1 to 2 .
5) Adjust the land condition factor from 1.0 to .95 due to the limited water frontage.

These adjustments increase the assessment from $\$ 566,300$ to $\$ 568,300$. I recommend their abatement request be denied.

ADDITIONAL NOTES: Adjusting the assessment to include the new 6'x 105' dock revises their assessment to $\$ 593,800$ for tax year 2014.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please don't hesitate to contact me.
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RECORD OF OWNERSHIP
CLEARY REV TRUST, MICHAEL J CLEARY, JOSEPH I
GOAT ISLAND PROPERTIES LLC GOAT ISLAND PROPERTIES LLC CLEARY, JOSEPH I
JALBERT, WALTER A

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | RE |
|  | RE |
|  | RE |

Description

2303
DURHAM, NH


This signature acknowledges a visit by a Data Collector or Assessor

| ASSESSING NEIGHBORHOOD |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NBHD/SUB | NBHD Name | Tracing |  |  |
| $0 / \mathbf{A}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1459*776 7-13-89 \$360,000
OB2, $3+4$ ATT
-10 RTE 4 INFL IF BLACK BP96-46 FCP>FGR 5/5/97DLL

BTH=LINO,
WIND STRS TO BSMT, BP 95-
51 4/17/96 INT DLL ENTRY
OPEN TO BSMT, KIT ISLAND
CABIN RNVTD\&RENTED YR RND

APPRAISED VALUE SUMMARY

| Appraised Bldg. Value (Card) | $\mathbf{1 9 1 , 0 0 0}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Appraised XF (B) Value (Bldg) | $\mathbf{3 , 5 0 0}$ |
| Appraised OB (L) Value (Bldg) | $\mathbf{1 , 4 0 0}$ |
| Appraised Land Value (Bldg) | $\mathbf{3 4 3 , 4 0 0}$ |
| Special Land Value | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Total Appraised Parcel Value | $\mathbf{5 6 6 , 3 0 0}$ |
| Valuation Method: | C |
| Adjustment: | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Net Total Appraised Parcel Value | $\mathbf{5 6 6 , 3 0 0}$ |






TOWN OF DURHAM
15 NEWMARKET ROAD
DURHAM, NH 03824-2898
Tel: 603/868-8064
Fax: 603/868-8033

## ABATEMENT RECOMMENDATION

DATE: July 21, 2014
TOWN OF: Durham
TO: Town Council
FROM: Jim Rice, CNHA
OWNER: Anh, Luan \& Irene Pham 191 Packers Falls Road Durham, NH 03824

REPRESENTATIVE: N/A
PROPERTY LOCATION: 191 Packers Falls Road, Durham, NH 03824
PID: 17-17
PROPERTY TAX YEAR APPEALED: 2013
APPLICATION FILING DATE W/MUNICIPALITY: March 4, 2014 (Although the filing deadline is $3 / 3 / 2014$ due to holiday, the application was post-marked February 28, 2014.)

INVENTORY FILING DATE (Filing Date April $15^{\text {th }}$ ): N/A
ASSESSMENT APPEALED: $\$ 326,000.00$
Municipalities may abate taxes "for good cause shown." RSA 76:16. Good cause is generally established by showing an error in the assessment calculation or a disproportionate assessment. Good cause can also be established by showing poverty and inability to pay the tax. If the abatement application is based on disproportionate assessment, the taxpayer has the burden to show how the assessment was disproportionate. To carry this burden the taxpayer must show:
a. What the property was worth (market value) on the assessment date.
b. The property's "equalized assessment" exceeded the property's market value. To calculate the equalized assessment, simply divide the assessment by the municipality's equalization ratio (assessment $\div$ ratio). Because a property's market value is a crucial issue, taxpayers must have an opinion of the market value estimate. Obtaining an appraisal or presenting sales of comparable properties can show this value estimate.

REASON(S) FOR APPEAL: The taxpayers assessment increased from $\$ 249,100$ to $\$ 326,000$ as a result of the 2013 statistical update. In 2012, their property was inspected by me and assessment reduced due to condition of the property. Since little or no renovations have been made to their property, they don't understand why their assessment increased.

ASSESSOR'S COMMENTS: In 2005, the main part of the house was moved back from the road and onto a new foundation. During the move, all of the existing fireplaces and chimneys were removed and have not been replaced. Also, the section of the house where the kitchen was located was not moved. Therefore, the house does not have a kitchen. The house requires extensive renovations and landscaping before an occupancy permit would be issued. On $5 / 24 / 12$, I inspected the property and applied functional depreciation of $35 \%$.

Subsequent to my inspection in 2012, the house was vandalized and stripped of all the copper pipes. To date, they not been replaced.

During the statistical update, this depreciation was inadvertently removed.
RECOMMENDATION: I recommend reapplying the functional depreciation of $35 \%$ and reviewing the property in 2015 for renovations.

This adjustment reduces the assessment from $\$ 326,000$ to $\$ 193,800$. I recommend granting their abatement request for the assessed value difference of $\$ 132,200$. This calculates to an abatement of $\$ 4,020.20(\$ 132.2 \times \$ 30.41)$ plus interest at six percent per annum from the date paid to refund date per RSA 76-17-a. If the taxes have not been paid, then no refund or interest is due.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please don't hesitate to contact me.


Property Location: 191 PACKERS FALLS ROAD
MAP ID: 17/ 17/ / /
Bldg Name:
State Use: 1013
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Functional Obslnc

External Obslnc
1
Cost Trend Factor
50
\% Complete
Overall \% Cond
Apprais Val
Dep \% Ovr
Dep Ovr Comment 188,900

Misc Imp Ovr
Misc Imp Ovr Comment
Cost to Cure Ovr
Cost to Cure Ovr Comment

## OB-OUTBUILDING \& YARD ITEMS(L)/XF-BUILDING EXTRA FEATURES(B)



| SHD1 | SHED FRAME |
| :--- | :--- |
| SHD1 | SHED FRAME |

BUILDING SUB-AREA SUMMARY SECTION

| Code | Description | Living Area | Gross Area | Eff. Area | Unit Cost | Undeprec. Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BAS | First Floor | 1,509 | 1,509 | 1,509 | 104.92 | 158,318 |
| EAF | Attic, Expansion, Finished | 105 | 300 | 105 | 36.72 | 11,016 |
| FOP | Porch, Open Framed | 0 | 102 | 20 | 20.57 | 2,098 |
| FUS | Upper Story, Finished | 1,209 | 1,209 | 1,209 | 104.92 | 126,843 |
| UAT | Attic, Unfinished | 0 | 1,209 | 121 | 10.50 | 12,695 |
| UBM | Basement, Unfinished | 0 | 1,209 | 242 | 21.00 | 25,390 |
| UGR | Garage, Undergrade | 0 | 420 | 126 | 31.47 | 13,219 |
| WDK | Deck, Wood | 0 | 120 | 12 | 10.49 | 1,259 $=$ |

Property Location: 191 PACKERS FALLS ROAD
MAP ID: 17/ $17 /$ / /
Bldg Name:
State Use: 1013


| Vision ID: 1534 | Account \# 1300 | Bldg \#: | 2 of 2 | Sec \#: | 1 of | 1 | Card | 2 | of | 2 | rint Date: 07/14/2014 14:57 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| CONSTRUCTION DETAIL |  |  |  | CONSTRUCTION DETALL (CONTINUED) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Element | Cd. | Ch. | Description | Element | Cd. ${ }^{\text {Ch. }}$ | Description |
| Style | 36 |  | Camp |  |  |  |
| Model | 01 |  | Residential |  |  |  |
| Grade | 02 |  | Below Average |  |  |  |
| Stories | 1 |  | 1 Story |  |  |  |
| Occupancy | 1 |  | Clapboard | MIXED USE |  |  |
| Exterior Wall 1 | 11 |  |  | Code | escription | Percentage |
| Exterior Wall 2 |  |  |  | 1013 SFR WA | TER MD | 01100 |
| Roof Structure | 03 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roof Cover | 03 |  | Gable/Hip <br> Asph/F Gls/Cmp |  |  |  |
| Interior Wall 1 | 03 |  | Plastered |  |  |  |
| Interior Wall 2 |  |  |  | COS | T/MARKE | VALUATION |
| Interior Flr 1 | 09 |  | Pine/Soft Wood | Adj. Base Rate: |  | 67.28 |
| Interior Flr 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 60,686 |
| Heat Fuel | 02 |  |  | Net Other Adj: |  | 3,251.25 |
| Heat Type | 06 |  | Oil | Replace Cost |  | 63,937 |
| AC Type | 01 |  | Steam | AYB |  | 1960 |
| AC Type |  |  | None | EYB |  | 1978 |
| Total Bedrooms | 01 |  | 1 Bedroom | Dep Code |  | FR |
| Total Bthrms | 1 |  |  | Remodel Rating |  |  |
| Total Half Baths |  |  |  | Year Remodeled |  |  |
| Total Xtra Fixtrs |  |  |  | Dep \% |  | 35 |
| Total Rooms |  |  |  | Functional Obslnc |  | 35 |
| Bath Style |  |  |  | External Obslnc |  |  |
| Kitchen Style |  |  |  | Cost Trend Factor |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Condition |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \% Complete |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Overall \% Cond |  | 30 |
|  |  |  |  | Apprais Val |  | 19,200 |
|  |  |  |  | Dep \% Ovr |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | Dep Ovr Commen |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Misc Imp Ovr |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | Misc Imp Ovr Con | mment |  |
|  |  |  |  | Cost to Cure Ovr |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | Cost to Cure Ovr | Comment |  |



| Code | Description | Living Area | Gross Area | Eff. Area | Unit Cost | Undeprec. Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BAS | First Floor | 450 | 450 | 450 | 67.28 | 30,276 |
| FGR | Garage, Framed | 0 | 1,100 | 440 | 26.91 | 29,603 |
| FOP | Porch, Open Framed | 0 | 62 | 12 | 13.02 | 807 |



## ABATEMENT RECOMMENDATION

DATE: July 21, 2014
TOWN OF: Durham

TO: Town Council
FROM: Jim Rice, CNHA
OWNER: Joseph A. \& Nancy C. Smath 89 Packers Falls Road Durham, NH 03824

REPRESENTATIVE: N/A
PROPERTY LOCATION: 89 Packers Falls Road, Durham, NH 03824
PID: 17-40
PROPERTY TAX YEAR APPEALED: 2013
APPLICATION FILING DATE W/MUNICIPALITY: February 7, 2014 (Filing deadline is $3 / 3 / 2014$ due to holiday)

INVENTORY FILING DATE (Filing Date April $15^{\text {th }}$ ): N/A
ASSESSMENT APPEALED: $\$ 362,200.00$
Municipalities may abate taxes "for good cause shown." RSA 76:16. Good cause is generally established by showing an error in the assessment calculation or a disproportionate assessment. Good cause can also be established by showing poverty and inability to pay the tax. If the abatement application is based on disproportionate assessment, the taxpayer has the burden to show how the assessment was disproportionate. To carry this burden the taxpayer must show:
a. What the property was worth (market value) on the assessment date.
b. The property's "equalized assessment" exceeded the property's market value. To calculate the equalized assessment, simply divide the assessment by the municipality's equalization ratio (assessment $\div$ ratio). Because a property's market value is a crucial issue, taxpayers must have an opinion of the market value estimate. Obtaining an appraisal or presenting sales of comparable properties can show this value estimate.

REASON(S) FOR APPEAL: The taxpayers assessment increased from $\$ 338,300$ to $\$ 362,200$ as a result of the 2013 statistical update. They believe their revised assessment did not account for the unfinished exterior siding and replacement windows.

ASSESSOR'S COMMENTS: On $3 / 21 / 13$, I inspected the property and applied functional depreciation of $5 \%$ because the owners were in the process of replacing their exterior siding and installing replacement windows. During the statistical update, this depreciation was inadvertently removed.

RECOMMENDATION: I recommend reapplying their functional depreciation of $5 \%$ and reviewing the property in 2015 for the completion of this project.

This adjustment reduces the assessment from $\$ 362,200$ to $\$ 346,800$. I recommend granting their abatement request for the assessed value difference of $\$ 15,400$. This calculates to an abatement of $\$ 468.31(\$ 15.4 \times \$ 30.41)$ plus interest at six percent per annum from the date paid to refund date per RSA $76-17-\mathrm{a}$. If the taxes have not been paid, then no refund or interest is due.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please don't hesitate to contact me.

## Property Location: 89 PACKERS FALLS ROAD

MAP ID: 17/ 40/ / /
Bldg Name:
State Use: 1010



| This signature acknowledges a visit by a Data Collector or Assessor |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| APPRAISED VALUE SUMMARY |  |
| Appraised Bldg. Value (Card) | $\mathbf{2 6 6 , 1 0 0}$ |
| Appraised XF (B) Value (Bldg) | $\mathbf{1 , 2 0 0}$ |
| Appraised OB (L) Value (Bldg) | 0 |
| Appraised Land Value (Bldg) | $\mathbf{9 4 , 9 0 0}$ |
| Special Land Value | 0 |
| Total Appraised Parcel Value | $\mathbf{3 6 2 , 2 0 0}$ |
| Valuation Method: | C |
| Adjustment: | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Net Total Appraised Parcel Value | $\mathbf{3 6 2 , 2 0 0}$ |

BK1454PG159 6-8-89 \$210.0
FULL DORMER
2012-REPLACED EXT SIDING \&
WINDOWS
Net Total Appraised Parcel Value
 CONSTRUCTION DETAIL $\quad$ CONSTRUCTION DETAIL (CONTINUED)

| CONSTRUCTION DETAIL |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Element | Cd. | Ch. | Description |


| Element | Cd. | Ch. | Desc |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MIXED USE |  |  |  |
| Code | Description |  |  |
| 1010 Sing | m M | DL- |  |
| COST/MARKET VALUATION |  |  |  |
| Adj. Base Rate: |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 93.44 \\ & 292,667 \end{aligned}$ |
| Net Other Adj: |  |  | $13,200.00$ |
| Replace Cost |  |  | 305,867 |
|  |  |  | 1987 |
| EYB |  |  | 2000 |
| Dep Code |  |  | AV |
| Remodel Rating |  |  |  |
| Dep \% |  |  | 13 |
| Functional Obslnc |  |  | 0 |
| External Obslnc |  |  | 0 |
| Cost Trend Factor |  |  | 1 |
| Condition |  |  |  |
| Overall \% Cond |  |  |  |
| Apprais Val |  |  | 266,100 |
| Dep \% Ovr |  |  | 0 |
| Dep Ovr Comment |  |  |  |
| Misc Imp Ovr |  |  | 0 |
| Misc Imp Ovr Comment |  |  |  |
| Cost to Cure Ovr |  |  |  |
| Cost to Cure | Comm |  | 0 |






TOWN OF DURHAM
15 NEWMARKET ROAD
DURHAM, NH 03824-2898
Tel: 603/868-8064
Fax: 603/868-8033

## ABATEMENT RECOMMENDATION

DATE: July 17, 2014
TOWN OF: Durham
TO: Town Council
FROM: Jim Rice, CNHA
OWNER: Jason S. \& Megan K. Lenk Revocable Trust
5 Hampshire Avenue
Durham, NH 03824
REPRESENTATIVE: N/A
PROPERTY LOCATION: 250 Newmarket Road, Durham, NH 03824
PID: 18-3-1
PROPERTY TAX YEAR APPEALED: 2013
APPLICATION FILING DATE W/MUNICIPALITY: February 24, 2014 (Filing deadline is $3 / 3 / 2014$ due to holiday)

INVENTORY FILING DATE (Filing Date April $15^{\text {th }}$ ): N/A
ASSESSMENT APPEALED: $\$ 358,600.00$
Municipalities may abate taxes "for good cause shown." RSA 76:16. Good cause is generally established by showing an error in the assessment calculation or a disproportionate assessment. Good cause can also be established by showing poverty and inability to pay the tax. If the abatement application is based on disproportionate assessment, the taxpayer has the burden to show how the assessment was disproportionate. To carry this burden the taxpayer must show:
a. What the property was worth (market value) on the assessment date.
b. The property's "equalized assessment" exceeded the property's market value. To calculate the equalized assessment, simply divide the assessment by the municipality's equalization ratio (assessment $\div$ ratio). Because a property's market value is a crucial issue, taxpayers must have an opinion of the market value estimate. Obtaining an appraisal or presenting sales of comparable properties can show this value estimate.

REASON(S) FOR APPEAL: The taxpayer's indicate that as of 3/1/13, the physical data on their assessment record card was incorrect because the interior of their house was demolished for renovations.

ASSESSOR'S COMMENTS: The property owners purchased their property on 2/3/12 for $\$ 340,000$. On $4 / 12 / 13$, they applied for a building permit to renovate the house. The permit was issued on $5 / 2 / 13$.

RECOMMENDATION: I recommend their abatement request be denied. According to the dates of the building permits, demolition of the house did not begin until after 4/1/13.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Property Location: 250 NEWMARKET ROAD
MAP ID: 18/3/1/ /
State Use: 1013


| EXEMPTIONS |  |  |  |  |  | Total: <br> ASSESSMENTS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | OTHER ASSESSMENTS |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Type | Description | Amount | Code | Description | Number | Amount | Comm. Int. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ASSESSING NEIGHBORHOOD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| This signature acknowledges a visit by a Data Collector or Assessor |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| APPRAISED VALUE SUMMARY |  |  |
| Appraised Bldg. Value (Card) | $218, \mathbf{8 0 0}$ |  |
| Appraised XF (B) Value (Bldg) | $\mathbf{2 , 3 0 0}$ |  |
| Appraised OB (L) Value (Bldg) | $\mathbf{1 3 , 3 0 0}$ |  |
| Appraised Land Value (Bldg) | $\mathbf{1 2 4 , 2 0 0}$ |  |
| Special Land Value | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |
| Total Appraised Parcel Value | $\mathbf{3 5 8 , 6 0 0}$ |  |
| Valuation Method: | C |  |
| Adjustment: | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |
| Net Total Appraised Parcel Value | $\mathbf{3 5 8 , 6 0 0}$ |  |

## EASEMENT FOR FLOWAGE RIGHTS PER DEED.

ROW ACCESS TO CEMETARY ON PROPERTY PER
DEED.
1/24/12 DISQUALIFIED FROM CU -
APPLIED LUCT
Net Total Appraised Parcel Value

Vision ID: $1632 \quad$ Bldg \#: 1 of 1 Sec \#: 1 of

CONSTRUCTION DETAIL

| Element | Cd. | Ch. | Description |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| MIXED USE |  |  |  |  |

Occupancy
Exterior Wall 1 Exterior Wall 2 Roof Structure 03 Roof Cover 03 nterior Wall 102 Interior Wall 2 nterior Flr 1 nterior Flr 2 Heat Fuel Heat Type AC Type Total Bedrooms Total Bthrms Total Half Baths Total Xtra Fixtrs Total Rooms Bath Style Kitchen Style

UCTION DETAIL Ranch Residential
Average
1 Story
Board \& Batten

Gable/Hip Asph/F Gls/Cmp Wall Brd/Wood

Carpet
Gas
Forced Air-Duc
Central
3 Bedrooms

| MIXED USE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Code | Description | Percentage |
| $\mathbf{1 0 1 3}$ | SFR WATER MDL-01 | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |


| COST/MARKET VALUATION |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Adj. Base Rate: | 69.49 |
|  | 269,552 |
| Net Other Adj: | $11,000.00$ |



| BUILDING SUB-AREA SUMMARY SECTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Code | Description | Living Area | Gross Area | Eff. Area | Unit Cost | Undeprec. Value |
| BAS | First Floor | 2,682 | 2,682 | 2,682 | 69.49 | 186,372 |
| FEP | Porch, Enclosed, Finished | 0 | 668 | 468 | 48.68 | 32,521 |
| FGR | Garage, Framed | 0 | 483 | 193 | 27.77 | 13,412 |
| UBM | Basement, Unfinished | 0 | 2,682 | 536 | 13.89 | 37,247 |

TOWN OF DURHAM
15 NEWMARKET ROAD
DURHAM, NH 03824-2898
Tel: 603/868-8064
Fax: 603/868-8033

## ABATEMENT RECOMMENDATION

DATE: July 22, 2014
TOWN OF: Durham
TO: Town Council
FROM: Jim Rice, CNHA
OWNER: John M. \& D. Bernice Tozier Revocable Trust 8 Ross Road Durham, NH 03824

REPRESENTATIVE: N/A
PROPERTY LOCATION: 8 Ross Road, Durham, NH 03824
PID: 18-18-5
PROPERTY TAX YEAR APPEALED: 2013
APPLICATION FILING DATE W/MUNICIPALITY: November 26, 2013 (Filing deadline is $3 / 3 / 2014$ due to holiday)

INVENTORY FILING DATE (Filing Date April 15 $5^{\text {th }}$ ): N/A
ASSESSMENT APPEALED: $\$ 371,200.00$
Municipalities may abate taxes "for good cause shown." RSA 76:16. Good cause is generally established by showing an error in the assessment calculation or a disproportionate assessment. Good cause can also be established by showing poverty and inability to pay the tax. If the abatement application is based on disproportionate assessment, the taxpayer has the burden to show how the assessment was disproportionate. To carry this burden the taxpayer must show:
a. What the property was worth (market value) on the assessment date.
b. The property's "equalized assessment" exceeded the property's market value. To calculate the equalized assessment, simply divide the assessment by the municipality's equalization ratio (assessment $\div$ ratio). Because a property's market value is a crucial issue, taxpayers must have an opinion of the market value estimate. Obtaining an appraisal or presenting sales of comparable properties can show this value estimate.

REASON(S) FOR APPEAL: The taxpayer's assessment increased from $\$ 366,200$ to $\$ 371,200$ due to the 2013 statistical update. The taxpayers indicate that portions of the interior of the house are unfinished and that they are being over-assessed.

ASSESSOR'S COMMENTS: On 7/14/14 and 7/18/14, attempts were made to contact the property owners to perform an interior inspection, but they do not have an answering machine to leave a message.

RECOMMENDATION: Since I am unable to inspect the interior of the property, I recommend their abatement request be denied.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please don't hesitate to contact me.




## ABATEMENT RECOMMENDATION

DATE: July 17, 2014
TOWN OF: Durham
TO: Town Council

FROM: Jim Rice, CNHA
OWNER: Ted Castonguay
Lynne Yorke Castonguay
39 Stagecoach Road
Durham, NH 03824
REPRESENTATIVE: N/A
PROPERTY LOCATION: 39 Stagecoach Road, Durham, NH 03824
PID: 18-19-1
PROPERTY TAX YEAR APPEALED: 2013
APPLICATION FILING DATE W/MUNICIPALITY: March 4, 2014 (Filing deadline is 3/3/2014 due to holiday)

INVENTORY FILING DATE (Filing Date April $15^{\text {th }}$ ): N/A
ASSESSMENT APPEALED: $\$ 543,700.00$
Municipalities may abate taxes "for good cause shown." RSA 76:16. Good cause is generally established by showing an error in the assessment calculation or a disproportionate assessment. Good cause can also be established by showing poverty and inability to pay the tax. If the abatement application is based on disproportionate assessment, the taxpayer has the burden to show how the assessment was disproportionate. To carry this burden the taxpayer must show:
a. What the property was worth (market value) on the assessment date.
b. The property's "equalized assessment" exceeded the property's market value. To calculate the equalized assessment, simply divide the assessment by the municipality's equalization ratio (assessment $\div$ ratio). Because a property's market value is a crucial issue, taxpayers must have an opinion of the market value estimate. Obtaining an appraisal or presenting sales of comparable properties can show this value estimate.

REASON(S) FOR APPEAL: The taxpayer's state they do not have a wood burning fireplace, but a gas fireplace.

RECOMMENDATION: I recommend adjusting the fireplace from wood burning to gas.
This adjustment reduces the assessment from $\$ 543,700$ to $\$ 540,200$.
I recommend their abatement request be denied because their application was untimely filed after the filing deadline.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please don't hesitate to contact me.



TOWN OF DURHAM<br>15 NEWMARKET ROAD<br>DURHAM, NH 03824-2898<br>Tel: 603/868-8064<br>Fax: 603/868-8033

## ABATEMENT RECOMMENDATION

DATE: July 17, 2014
TOWN OF: Durham
TO: Town Council
FROM: Jim Rice, CNHA
OWNER: Daniel F. \& Sarah P. Ford 433 Bay Road Durham, NH 03824

REPRESENTATIVE: N/A

PROPERTY LOCATION: 433 Bay Road, Durham, NH 03824
PID: 20-8-4 \& 20-8-5
PROPERTY TAX YEAR APPEALED: 2013
APPLICATION FILING DATE W/MUNICIPALITY: February 26, 2014 (Filing deadline is 3/3/2014 due to holiday).

INVENTORY FILING DATE (Filing Date April $15^{\text {th }}$ ): N/A

## ASSESSMENT APPEALED: \$760,863.00 (Current Use) \$864,600.00 (without Current Use)

Municipalities may abate taxes "for good cause shown." RSA 76:16. Good cause is generally established by showing an error in the assessment calculation or a disproportionate assessment. Good cause can also be established by showing poverty and inability to pay the tax. If the abatement application is based on disproportionate assessment, the taxpayer has the burden to show how the assessment was disproportionate. To carry this burden the taxpayer must show:
a. What the property was worth (market value) on the assessment date.
b. The property's "equalized assessment" exceeded the property's market value. To calculate the equalized assessment, simply divide the assessment by the municipality's equalization ratio (assessment $\div$ ratio). Because a property's market value is a crucial issue, taxpayers must have an opinion of the market value estimate. Obtaining an appraisal or presenting sales of comparable properties can show this value estimate.

REASON(S) FOR APPEAL: The tax maps show that their lot has water frontage on Great Bay, when it does not. During the 2013 statistical update, the property was assessed as a water-front lot. As a result, they believe the land portion of their assessment is excessively assessed.

ASSESSOR'S COMMENTS: The subject property is comprised of 32.25 acres with a 1,700'+/driveway accessing the home-site from Bay Road. The house-site is located on a small peninsula with a $270+/$ - degree seasonal view of Great Bay. Topography of the site is gently rolling land from Bay road to the home-site with mature coniferous and deciduous vegetation. The home-site is fairly level with a large lawn area, foundation shrubs and flowering plants. Mature coniferous and deciduous trees border the easterly boundary line, seasonally obstructing some of their views of Great Bay.

The subject property does not have frontage on Great Bay. In 1994, the owners annexed their entire water frontage to abutting lot 8-4 (also owned by the Ford's) and placed the entire water frontage under Current Use. They also granted themselves an access easement to Great Bay across a portion of the water frontage on abutting lot 8-4. The tax maps were not updated to show the revised lot-line adjustment.

In 1982, the home-site was improved with a $2,352+/$ - square foot center chimney cape style house. The first floor is comprised of post'n beam construction with beamed ceilings, built-in book shelves, a large Rumford fireplace, wide pine floors and an open-concept design. The second floor is comprised of a full dormer with two bedrooms and two full bathrooms. A $16^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}$ screen porch with vaulted ceiling and brick floor is attached to the house. The house is considered to be of good quality construction, architectural design and materials.

The house-site has also been improved with a 2-car detached garage and a 30'x 40 ' detached "garage" with 2-bedroom apartment. With the exception of the garage (which is used as a work-shop), the interior is finished with knotty pine vertical board walls, pine floors and beamed ceilings.

In 2002 and 2003, the owner's appealed their assessment to the Board of Tax and Land Appeals because their property was assessed as a waterfront property, when the entire water frontage was annexed to abutting lot 8-4. In their decision, the Board found:
> "the Taxpayers and any subsequent heirs and assigns of Lot 5 will enjoy most of the same benefits that Great Bay waterfront properties enjoy with the exception of being able to control the vegetation on lot 4, which could impede Lot 5 's view of Great Bay, and who can access the strip on Lot 4".

"In weighing all the rights that are still contained in the bundle of rights of Lot 5, the Board has estimated the value rights embodied in Lot 4 for controlling the tree growth and public access is about 10\%".

In the footnotes, the Board also addressed the following:
> "The Board noted that technically the portion of Lot 4 that is encumbered with the dock should not qualify for Current Use assessment because of such improvements. The Town should have assessed the market value of the dock and small area it encompasses on Lot 4 and reduce the eligible land for Current Use by that area".

RECOMMENDATION: Based on the aforementioned information, I recommend the following adjustments be made to the assessment record card:

1) Adjust the land condition factor on land line 1 from 1.00 to .80 to account for the lack of view control and tidal mudflats. There is no deep water access.
2) Adjust the "Grade" of the house from "Average" to Average +20 " due to the quality of construction, architectural design and materials. This adjustment is more consistent with a very similar house located at 15 Edgerly Garrison that was built by the same builder. The only difference between the two is that 15 Edgerly Garrison has a very low posted first floor, minimal kitchen cabinetry, no built-in book shelves, no Rumford Fireplace and the second floor has inferior finish when compared to the subject property.
3) Remove the dock from the assessment.
4) Adjust the "Grade" of the detached garage w/apartment from "Average" to "Average +20 ".
5) Adjust the sketch of the garage/apt to include first floor finish as you walk-in the front door. This was previously coded as part of the garage.
6) Apply $5 \%$ functional depreciation to the garage/apt because portions of the finished areas do not have central heat.

These adjustments reduce the assessment (w/o Current Use) from $\$ 864,600$ to $\$ 818,100$. Applying the 2013 median equalization ratio of $97.9 \%$ to the revised assessment reveals an estimated market value of $\$ 835,600.00(\$ 818,100 / .979 \%)$ as of $4 / 1 / 13$.

Since the property is enrolled under the Current Use program and property taxes are based on the Current Use assessment, the aforementioned adjustments reduce the Current Use assessment from \$760,863 to $\$ 714,716$. I recommend granting the abatement request for the assessed value difference of $\$ 46,147$. This calculates to an abatement of $\$ 1,403.33$ ( $\$ 46.147 \mathrm{x} \$ 30.41$ ) plus interest at six percent per annum from the date paid to refund date per RSA 76-17-a. If the taxes have not been paid, then no refund or interest is due.

## ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the Board of Tax and Land Appeal findings, I recommend the following adjustments to abutting lot 8-4:

1) Remove $40+/$ - square feet of water frontage from Current Use because it is encumbered with a dock which is not permitted on land in Current Use per RSA 79-A.
2) Apply a land condition factor of .75 to land line 1 for tidal mudflats and for this land to be exclusively used by the owner of lot 8-5.
3) Add the assessment of the dock to from lot 8-5 to lot 8-4.

These adjustments increase the [Current Use] assessment from $\$ 183.00$ to $\$ 16,422$.
If you have any questions regarding this information, please don't hesitate to contact me.





CONSTRUCTION DETAIL
 CONSTRUCTION DETAIL (CONTINUED)

| Element | Cd. | Ch. | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model | $\mathbf{0 0}$ |  | Vacant |

MIXED USE

| MIXED USE |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Code | Description | Percentage |
| $\mathbf{6 3 0 6}$ | OTHER - MNG - GD | 100 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

COST/MARKET VALUATION

| Adj. Base Rate: | 0.0 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 0 |
| Net Other Adj: | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ |

Net Other Adj: $\quad \mathbf{0 . 0 0}$
Replace Cost 0
AYB
YB
Dep Code
Remodel Rating
Year Remodeled
Dep \%
Functional Obslnc
External Obslnc
Cost Trend Factor
Condition
\% Complete
Overall \% Cond
Apprais Val
Dep \% Ovr
Dep Ovr Comment
Dep Ovr Comn
Misc Imp Ovr
Misc Imp Ovr
Misc Imp Ovr Comment
Cost to Cure Ovr
Cost to Cure Ovr Comment
0.00
0.00
0

0
0


1

0
0
0

OB-OUTBUILDING \& YARD ITEMS(L) / XF-BUILDING EXTRA FEATURES(B)


Property Location: 433 BAY ROAD






TOWN OF DURHAM<br>15 NEWMARKET ROAD<br>DURHAM, NH 03824-2898<br>Tel: 603/868-8064<br>Fax: 603/868-8033

## ABATEMENT RECOMMENDATION

DATE: July 17, 2014
TOWN OF: Durham
TO: Town Council
FROM: Jim Rice, CNHA
OWNER: 36 Adams Point Road c/o Elbert W. Kelley, Jr. 34 Hunters Run Rye, NH 03873

REPRESENTATIVE: N/A
PROPERTY LOCATION: 36 Adams Point Road, Durham, NH 03824
PID: 20-9-3
PROPERTY TAX YEAR APPEALED: 2013
APPLICATION FILING DATE W/MUNICIPALITY: February 20, 2014 (Filing deadline is $3 / 3 / 2014$ due to holiday)

INVENTORY FILING DATE (Filing Date April $15^{\text {th }}$ ): N/A
ASSESSMENT APPEALED: $\$ 343,000.00$ (without Current Use) \$322,634.00 (with Current Use)

Municipalities may abate taxes "for good cause shown." RSA 76:16. Good cause is generally established by showing an error in the assessment calculation or a disproportionate assessment. Good cause can also be established by showing poverty and inability to pay the tax. If the abatement application is based on disproportionate assessment, the taxpayer has the burden to show how the assessment was disproportionate. To carry this burden the taxpayer must show:
a. What the property was worth (market value) on the assessment date.
b. The property's "equalized assessment" exceeded the property's market value. To calculate the equalized assessment, simply divide the assessment by the municipality's equalization ratio (assessment $\div$ ratio). Because a property's market value is a crucial issue, taxpayers must have an opinion of the market value estimate. Obtaining an appraisal or presenting sales of comparable properties can show this value estimate.

REASON(S) FOR APPEAL: The taxpayers believe their assessment should reflect only the land because shortly after purchasing the property, they demolished all of the buildings.

ASSESSOR'S COMMENTS: The subject property is comprised of 11.27 acres with approximately 300 ' frontage on Adams Point Road and a 50' right-of-way to Crommet Creek. The property has a $45+/-$ degree distant view of Great Bay.

On 6/28/13, the owners purchased the property from U.S. Bank \& Trust (at auction) for $\$ 276,000$. This transfer was not considered an "arm's length" transaction because it was a bank-owned property.

At the time of purchase, the property was comprised of an antique cape circa 1800, a detached barn and several detached sheds. The house and barn were in poor condition. On 10/10/2013, the owner obtained a demolition permit to demolish all the buildings.

As of $4 / 1 / 13$ and at the time of purchase, the taxpayer had the right to rebuild the residential dwelling on the existing footprint of the entire structure per zoning ordinance 175-30.B.

RECOMMENDATION: I recommend their abatement request be denied because as of $4 / 1 / 13$, the bundle of rights included the right to build or rebuild on the existing foundation.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Removal of the buildings due to demolition reduced the assessment (without Current Use) from $\$ 343,000$ to $\$ 270,100$. Applying the median equalization ratio to the revised assessment reveals an estimated market value of $\$ 275,900$ as if $4 / 1 / 13$.

Since the property is enrolled under the Current Use program and property taxes are based on the Current Use assessment, removing the buildings reduces the Current Use assessment from \$322,634 to \$249,679.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please don't hesitate to contact me.


36 Adams Point Road
View of House Before Demolition


36 Adams Point Road View of Great Bay




| CONSTRUCTION DETAIL |  |  |  | CONSTRUCTION DETAIL (CONTINUED) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Element | Cd. | Ch. | Description | Element | Cd. Ch. | Description |
| Model | 00 |  | Vacant |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | MIXED USE |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Code | Description | Percentage |
|  |  |  |  | 6000 FA |  | 100 |
|  |  |  |  | COST/MARKET VALUATION |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Adj. Base Rate: $\mathbf{0 . 0 0}$ <br> Net Other Adj: $\mathbf{0}$ <br>  $\mathbf{0 . 0 0}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Net Other Adj: <br> Replace Cost |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  | EYB |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | Dep Code |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Remodel Rating |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Year Remodeled |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Dep \% |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Functional Obslnc |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | External ObsInc |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Cost Trend Factor Condition |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \% Complete Overall \% Cond |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Apprais ValDep \% Ovr |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Dep Ovr Comment |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Misc Imp Ovr Comment |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Cost to Cure Ovr |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## ABATEMENT RECOMMENDATION

DATE: July 21, 2014
TOWN OF: Durham
TO: Town Council
FROM: Jim Rice, CNHA
OWNER: Kang Wu
Yuan Zhao
5 Surrey Lane
Durham, NH 03824
REPRESENTATIVE: N/A
PROPERTY LOCATION: 5 Surrey Lane, Durham, NH 03824
PID: 22-27
PROPERTY TAX YEAR APPEALED: 2013
APPLICATION FILING DATE W/MUNICIPALITY: February 28, 2014 (Filing deadline is $3 / 3 / 2014$ due to holiday)

INVENTORY FILING DATE (Filing Date April $15^{\text {th }}$ ): N/A
ASSESSMENT APPEALED: $\$ 419,600.00$
Municipalities may abate taxes "for good cause shown." RSA 76:16. Good cause is generally established by showing an error in the assessment calculation or a disproportionate assessment. Good cause can also be established by showing poverty and inability to pay the tax. If the abatement application is based on disproportionate assessment, the taxpayer has the burden to show how the assessment was disproportionate. To carry this burden the taxpayer must show:
a. What the property was worth (market value) on the assessment date.
b. The property's "equalized assessment" exceeded the property's market value. To calculate the equalized assessment, simply divide the assessment by the municipality's equalization ratio (assessment $\div$ ratio). Because a property's market value is a crucial issue, taxpayers must have an opinion of the market value estimate. Obtaining an appraisal or presenting sales of comparable properties can show this value estimate.

REASON(S) FOR APPEAL: The taxpayer's purchased their property $7 / 2 / 2013$ for $\$ 369,500$ and believe their revised assessment of $\$ 419,600$ does not reflect market value as of 4/1/13.

ASSESSOR'S COMMENTS: During my inspection with the property owner on $7 / 15 / 14$, it was noted that the clapboards below the first floor windows are rotted all around the house. The owners are in the process of replacing these clapboards. Also, several of the wooden storm windows are rotted and need to be replaced. There is also water damage to the ceiling above the kitchen sink due to a leaky pipe from the $2^{\text {nd }}$ floor bathroom. The owners received $\$ 5,000$ cash back at the closing due to this deferred maintenance.

RECOMMENDATION: Based on the aforementioned information, I recommend the following adjustments be made to the assessment record card:

1) Adjust the sketch to the $11^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}$ section of the house to include a finished attic area.
2) Adjust the "Grade" of the house from "Average +20 " to Average +10 ".
3) Apply functional depreciation of $10 \%$ for the deferred maintenance.

These adjustments reduce the assessment from $\$ 419,600$ to $\$ 366,900$. Applying the 2013 median equalization ratio of $97.9 \%$ to the revised assessment reveals an estimated market value of $\$ 374,800$ as of 4/1/13.

I recommend granting their abatement request for the assessed value difference of $\$ 52,700$. However, since they did not pay property taxes for a full tax year (only from 7/2/13 thru 3/31/14), I recommend prorating their abatement to the date of sale $7 / 2 / 13$. This calculates to an abatement of $\$ 891.31$ ( $\$ 52.7 \mathrm{x}$ $\$ 30.41 / 365$ days x 203 days) plus interest at six percent per annum from the date paid to refund date per RSA 76-17-a. If the taxes have not been paid, then no refund or interest is due.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please don't hesitate to contact me.



Property Location: 5 SURREY LANE
MAP ID: 22/27/ / /
Bldg Name:
State Use: 1010


Property Location: 5 SURREY LANE
Vision ID: 1875

| CONSTRUCTION DETAIL |  |  |  | CONSTRUCTION DETAIL (CONTINUED) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Element | Cd. | Ch. | Description | Element |  | Cd. | Ch. | Description |
| Style | 03 |  | Colonial |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model | 01 |  | Residential |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | 05 |  | Average + 20 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stories | 2.5 |  | $21 / 2$ Stories |  |  |  |  |  |
| Occupancy | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | IIXED |  |
| Exterior Wall 1 | 11 |  | Clapboard | Cod |  | escri | tion | Percentage |
| Exterior Wall 2 |  |  |  | 101 | Singl | am 1 | DL-01 | 100 |
| Roof Structure | 03 |  | Gable/Hip |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roof Cover | 03 |  | Asph/F Gls/Cmp |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interior Wall 1 | 05 |  | Drywall/Sheet |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interior Wall 2 |  |  |  |  |  | T/M | RKET | UATION | Interior Flr $1 \quad 12$ Interior Flr 2 Heat Fuel


| Heat Type | 05 | Hot Water |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| AC Type | 01 | None |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Total Bedrooms | 04 | 4 Bedrooms |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Brons |  |  |

Total Half Baths Total Xtra Fixtrs Total Rooms Bath Style Kitchen Style


$\square$
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| BUILDING SUB-AREA SUMMARY SECTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Code | Description | Living Area | Gross Area | Eff. Area | Unit Cost | Undeprec. Value |
| BAS | First Floor | 1,452 | 1,452 | 1,452 | 84.94 | 123,327 |
| FGR | Garage, Framed | 0 | 624 | 250 | 34.03 | 21,234 |
| FHS | Half Story, Finished | 774 | 1,548 | 774 | 42.47 | 65,740 |
| FOP | Porch, Open Framed | 0 | 98 | 20 | 17.33 | 1,699 |
| FUS | Upper Story, Finished | 924 | 924 | 924 | 84.94 | 78,481 |
| UBM | Basement, Unfinished | 0 | 1,298 | 260 | 17.01 | 22,083 |
| WDK | Deck, Wood | 0 | 224 | 22 | 8.34 | 1,869 |
|  | Til. Gross Liv/Lease Area: | 3,150 | 6,168 | 3,702 |  | 333,033 |

