



The remaining .24 acres was classified waste land with zero value. Appellant amended the value claim at hearing and contends the correct total valuation is \$35,950.

Appellant purchased subject in 1991 for \$17,500. Appellant explained since that time subject's assessed value increased approximately 400%. Appellant maintained Respondent was comparing subject to smaller waterfront properties. Appellant argued using those types of comparables results in a higher value for subject. Appellant explained the well on subject is only 30 feet deep and the septic system is original. Appellant asserted because of the well depth, and age of the site improvements, their assessed value should be approximately \$1,500. Respondent explained all properties containing well and septic have an onsite improvement value of \$10,000, regardless of the depth or age.

Appellant provided assessed values of neighboring properties arguing subject's assessed value was high by comparison. The neighboring properties each contained different land sizes, along with varying sized improvements. Respondent noted the properties Appellant was comparing with subject were mostly bare lots, as opposed to wooded lots like subject. Respondent explained all wooded parcels in the area were valued at \$20,000 per acre.

Appellant provided information regarding nine (9) sales. Three (3) sales took place in 2014, two (2) sold in 2015, three (3) sold in 2016, and the date of the remaining sale was not provided. The sales ranged between 4.86 and 28 acres in size. Sale prices were between \$39,000 and \$158,000. Respondent argued Appellant's sales were not

comparable to subject because they were flat and bare parcels. Photographs were provided to demonstrate the sale lots were not similar to subject.

In support of subject's assessed value, Respondent offered information concerning six (6) sales. The sales took place between 2011 and 2015. The land sales were similar to subject in terms of being wooded parcels. Parcel sizes ranged from 1.05 acres to 9.77 acres. The sale prices indicated value rates between \$18,587 and \$38,095 per acre. Based on these sales, Respondent concluded wooded parcels were selling higher than bare acreage. Respondent assessed all the wooded parcels in the area at \$20,000 per acre.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

This Board's goal in its hearings is the acquisition of sufficient, accurate evidence to support a determination of fair market value, or as applicable exempt status. This Board, giving full opportunity for all arguments and having considered all testimony and documentary evidence submitted by the parties in support of their respective positions, hereby enters the following.

Idaho Code § 63-205 requires taxable property be assessed at market value annually on January 1; January 1, 2016 in this case. Market value is defined in Idaho Code § 63-201, as,

“Market value” means the amount of United States dollars or equivalent for which, in all probability, a property would exchange hands between a willing seller, under no compulsion to sell, and an informed, capable buyer, with a reasonable time allowed to consummate the sale, substantiated by a reasonable down or full cash payment.

Market value is estimated according to recognized appraisal methods and techniques. There are three (3) primary approaches to value, the sales comparison approach, the cost approach, and the income approach. *Merris v. Ada County*, 100 Idaho 59, 63, 593 P.2d 394, 398 (1979). Residential property is commonly valued using the sales comparison approach.

Appellant had concern about the land value and the \$10,000 value for the onsite improvements. Regarding the \$10,000 value, Respondent explained it represents a standard rate applied to all parcels with onsite improvements. The fact the well is not deep and the septic is old does not preclude them from use or assessment. In the Board's view, the homesite was improved to accommodate a dwelling, and as such, the onsite improvement value is reasonable.

Looking at the land valuation, Appellant provided nine (9) sales. The sales depicted by photographs revealed flat, bare acreage parcels. The Board did not find these sales similar to subject's wooded acreage. Respondent offered information regarding six (6) sales of wooded properties. Respondent reported the sale prices per acre ranged between \$18,587 and \$38,095. Subject was assessed for \$20,000 per acre. The Board found Respondent's sales information to be superior to that offered by Appellant.

Appellant also provided a comparison of assessed values along with sales of properties for the Board's consideration. Comparison of assessed values is not a recognized appraisal practice. Further, the Board found the parcels most similar to subject's wooded topography were all assessed at the same rate. This leads the Board

to conclude subject is not over assessed when compared to similar neighboring parcels.

Appellant requested subject's value be reduced to \$35,950. There is insufficient evidence in the record to support this value. Idaho Code § 63-511 places the burden on Appellant to establish Respondent's valuation is erroneous by a preponderance of the evidence. The Board did not find the burden of proof satisfied. Appellant did not provide sufficient market information to reduce subject's value.

For the reasons above, the decision of the Jefferson County Board of Equalization is affirmed.

#### FINAL ORDER

In accordance with the foregoing Final Decision, IT IS ORDERED that the decision of the Jefferson County Board of Equalization concerning the subject parcel be, and the same hereby is, AFFIRMED.

DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2016.