

G. Henry Crawford

v.

Town of Goshen

Docket Nos.: 7631-89, 10489-90 and 12463-91 PT

DECISION

The "Taxpayer" appeals, pursuant to RSA 76:16-a, the "Town's" 1989, 1990 and 1991 assessments of \$119,800 (land, \$101,400; buildings, \$18,400) on a cape 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 assessments were 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 assessments were excessive because:

- (1) a septic, site assessment determined that state and Town waivers would be required to upgrade the septic system;
- (2) there is a culvert which flows through the Property, which results in beach erosion, wetness and the Property being unbuildable;
- (3) the topography warrants an additional depreciation; and

(5) the land assessment should be reduced by 10%, resulting in a \$91,260 land assessment.

The Town argued the assessments were proper because:

- (1) the Property's front-foot value is within range of comparable sales; and
- (2) a 10% topography adjustment was made in 1990, resulting in the current assessment.

#### **Board's Rulings**

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 percent to a maximum of 10 percent 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

Page 3

Crawford v. Town of Goshen

Docket Nos.: 7631-89, 10489-90 and 12463-91 PT

undeveloped lots have such severe ledge or drainage conditions or abut 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.

Therefore, the board finds the undeveloped factor for this Property should be reduced an additional ten percent for the lack of a septic system. This results in a proper assessment of \$109,750 (land, \$91,350; building, \$18,400).

If the taxes have been paid, the amount paid on the value in excess of \$109,750 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.

Page 4

Crawford v. Town of Goshen

Docket Nos.: 7631-89, 10489-90 and 12463-91 PT

SO ORDERED.

BOARD OF TAX AND LAND APPEALS

---

Paul B. Franklin, Member

---

Ignatius MacLellan, Esq., Member

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