

Joseph A. Nordstrom

v.

Town of Goshen

Docket No.: 7557-89

DECISION

The "Taxpayer" appeals, pursuant to RSA 76:16-a, the "Town's" 1989 assessment of \$128,050 (land \$108,500; buildings \$19,550) on a split-level house on Rand Pond Road (the Property). For the reasons stated below, the appeal for abatement is granted.

The Taxpayer has the burden of showing the assessment was disproportionately high or unlawful, resulting in the Taxpayer paying an unfair and disproportionate share of taxes. See RSA 76:16-a; Tax 201.04(e); Appeal of Town of Sunapee, 126 N.H. 214, 217 (1985). We find the Taxpayer carried this burden and proved disproportionality.

The Taxpayer argued the assessment was excessive because:

- (1) the frontage is steep, rocky and ledgy; and
- (2) an additional 10% topography depreciation is warranted.

The Town argued the assessment was proper because:

- (1) the Property's front-foot value is within range of comparable sales;
- (2) a 10% topography adjustment was made in 1990 to conform with other lots as

well as a well-value adjustment because the water is not drinkable; and

Page 2

Nordstrom v. Town of Goshen

Docket No.: 7557-89

3) the building received an additional functional depreciation.

Board's Rulings

Based on the evidence, we find the correct assessment should be \$112,200 (land \$93,900; building \$18,300). This assessment is ordered because:

(1) the Town adjusted the assessment in 1991 by removing the assessment on the septic system and giving an additional -5% for functional depreciation, which we adopt for 1989; and

(2) the undeveloped factor should be reduced an additional 10%.

The Town submitted an analysis of the seven Rand Pond sales from which the base land values were derived (Exhibit TN-A). The three sales of undeveloped lots required substantial adjustments for size, condition or buildability, and were not heavily relied upon by the Town. The four sales of developed properties were of cottages or dwellings with operating septic systems and varying water supplies. From those four sales, residual land prices of \$1000 for waterfront and \$500 for rear lots were derived, using the New Hampshire Department of Revenue Administration's (DRA) land tables. The DRA land tables allow a minimum of 5% to a maximum of 10% for the difference between a developed lot and an undeveloped lot. Additionally, for developed lots, \$4,500 was added for a septic system or \$1,000 for a holding tank.

The consistent evidence submitted in the 30 Rand Pond appeals was that septic systems were difficult and expensive to construct due to the small size of many of the lots and limiting soil conditions. Those with modern systems are of the expensive "pump up" design. Many developed lots have only holding

tanks because the lots cannot support septic systems. Some of the small undeveloped lots have such severe ledge or drainage conditions or abut

Page 3
Nordstrom v. Town of Goshen
Docket No.: 7557-89

existing water supplies that installing a septic system would be impossible or economically infeasible.

Based on these facts, the board finds the DRA undeveloped factors and the septic and holding tank values do not adequately account for the difference in market value between properties with septic systems and those that are undeveloped or have only a holding tank. These value differences should reflect not only the "cost to cure" but also any uncertainty the market would perceive in valuing such properties when compared with properties with septic systems.

If the taxes have been paid, the amount paid on the value in excess of \$112,200 shall be refunded with interest at six percent per annum from date paid to refund date. RSA 76:17-a.

Motions for reconsideration of this decision must be filed within twenty (20) days of the clerk's date below, not the date received. RSA 541:3. The motion must state with specificity the reasons supporting the request, but generally new evidence will not be accepted. Filing this motion is a prerequisite for appealing to the supreme court. RSA 541:6.

SO ORDERED.

BOARD OF TAX AND LAND APPEALS

Paul B. Franklin, Member

Ignatius MacLellan, Esq., Member

Page 4

Nordstrom v. Town of Goshen

Docket No.: 7557-89

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify a copy of the foregoing decision has been mailed this date, postage prepaid, to Gary J. Karp, Representative for the Taxpayer; Department of Revenue Administration; and Chairman, Selectmen of Goshen.

Dated: January 15, 1993

Valerie B. Lanigan, Clerk

0005