

BOARD OF ASSESSORS MINUTES
May 19, 2022
CITY HALL – CONFERENCE ROOM 200B
5:30 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER: Board chair L. Miner called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

RECORDING SECRETARY: Tara Baker

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL: Present were, board chair Lenny Miner, member Jim Rice and member Karen Mudgett.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tara Baker, Emily Goldstein

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S): Minutes from April 21, 2022, were reviewed and accepted as written.

PUBLIC HEARINGS: None

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

Scott A. Everett, 274-178-3: The property owner filed an abatement request on their waterfront dwelling located at 16 Paugus Park Rd. This residential property is improved with a conventional style average grade building and has 70' of frontage on Paugus Bay. The property was purchased in August of 2017 for \$600,000, and they have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$498,820. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report.

Subsequent to the 2017 sale the property had been renovated under a building permit issued 1/8/2018. Two inspections of the property were completed following the renovations. An exterior review from the street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property is not accurately depicted is not supported by any provided or available evidence.

Given the claim of inaccurate recognition of deferred maintenance items impacting the valuation of the property, an inspection is necessary. We began the process of contacting the property owner's representatives on March 17, 2022 to schedule such an inspection. Despite numerous requests over the last several weeks no inspection has been provided.

Without having an inspection, any specific condition information, and/or report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K.

Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

Scott A. Everett Living Trust, 290-416-1.10: The property owner filed an abatement request on their condominium unit located at 21 Fells Way, Unit B. This residential property is improved with a townhouse style condominium unit. The property was purchased in August of 2013 for \$120,000, and they have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$104,650. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report.

An exterior review from the street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property is not accurately depicted is not supported by any provided or available evidence.

Given the claim of inaccurate recognition of deferred maintenance items impacting the valuation of the property, an inspection is necessary. We began the process of contacting the property owner's representatives on March 17, 2022 to schedule such an inspection. Despite numerous requests over the last several weeks no inspection has been provided.

Without having an inspection, any specific condition information, and/or report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K. Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

RE Closing, 287-307-13: The property owner filed an abatement request on their commercial warehouse and office building located at 87 Van Buren Rd. The lot is 7.52 acres in size. The property was purchased in April of 2015 as vacant land for a consideration of \$75,000, and they have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$216,300. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report.

Subsequent to the 2015 sale the property had been improved with a warehouse/office building and an outdoor tennis court. The building has been renovated under a building permit issued 4/1/2017. Two inspections of the property were completed following the renovations. An exterior review from the street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property is not accurately depicted is not supported by any provided or available evidence.

Given the claim of inaccurate recognition of deferred maintenance items impacting the valuation of the property, an inspection is necessary. We began the process of contacting the property owner's representatives on March 17, 2022 to schedule such an inspection. Despite numerous requests over the last several weeks no inspection has been provided.

Without having an inspection, any specific condition information, and/or report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K. Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

RE Closing, 273-275-7: The property owner filed an abatement request on their vacant building lot located on Davidson Drive. The lot is .63 acres in size. The property was purchased in April of 2015 as part of a multiple parcel transaction, and they have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$106,260. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement

unsupported by any evidence or report.

No inspection of the property has been completed in more than ten years. A review from the street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property is not accurately depicted cannot be supported or refuted by any provided or available evidence, and is inapplicable to this vacant piece of land.

Without having any specific report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K. Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

Paugus Fore 1, 367-81-13: The property owner filed an abatement request on their three-unit residential building located at 21 Fore Street. The property was purchased in June of 2021 as part of a two-property sale that included 79 Elm Street for a recorded consideration of \$1,000,000. They have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$157,360. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report. An exterior review from the street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property was not accurately depicted is not supported by any provided or available evidence. The overall condition rating was good for a 160 years old building, and the total depreciation represented 30% of the building costs.

Given the claim of inaccurate recognition of deferred maintenance items impacting the valuation of the property, an inspection is necessary. We began the process of contacting the property owner's representatives on March 17, 2022 to schedule such an inspection. Despite numerous requests over the last several weeks no inspection has been provided.

At the time of the combined sale with 79 Elm Street, the combined assessment for these two properties was \$914,400.

Without having an inspection, any specific condition information, and/or report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K. Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

Paugus Fore I, 367-71-15: The property owner filed an abatement request on their 14-unit apartment building located at 79 Elm Street. As of April 1, 2021, this property was improved, but the building has since been removed from the site. The property was purchased in June of 2021 as part of a two-property sale that included 21 Fore Street for a recorded consideration of \$1,000,000. They have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$482,720. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report. An exterior review from the street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022, however the improvements had already been demolished. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property was not accurately depicted is not supported by any provided or available evidence. The overall condition rating was good for a 120 years old building, and the total depreciation represented 30% of the building costs. At the time of the purchase all 14 of the residential units in the building were occupied.

Given the claim of inaccurate recognition of deferred maintenance items impacting the valuation

of the property, an inspection is necessary. We began the process of contacting the property owner's representatives on March 17, 2022 to schedule such an inspection. Despite numerous requests over the last several weeks no inspection has been provided.

At the time of the combined sale with 21 Fore Street, the combined assessment for these two properties was \$914,400.

Without having an inspection, any specific condition information, and/or report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K. Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

NH Big Island Co., 350-168-20: The property owner filed an abatement request on their residential building located at 9 North Street. This residential property is improved with a two-family building. The property has direct frontage on Paugus Bay, and has a 1,560 square foot boathouse. The property was purchased in September of 2016 for a reported consideration of \$500,000 as part of a multiple parcel transaction. They have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$223,590. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report.

An exterior review from the street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property is not accurately depicted is not supported by any provided or available evidence. The overall condition rating is fair, and the total depreciation represents 50% of the building costs.

Given the claim of inaccurate recognition of deferred maintenance items impacting the valuation of the property, an inspection is necessary. We began the process of contacting the property owner's representatives on March 17, 2022 to schedule such an inspection. Despite numerous requests over the last several weeks no inspection has been provided.

Without having an inspection, any specific condition information, and/or report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K. Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

NH Big Island Co., 350-168-19: The property owner filed an abatement request on their residential building located at 17 North Street. This residential property is improved with a two-family building. The property has direct frontage on Paugus Bay, and has five boat slips. The property was purchased in September of 2016 for a reported consideration of \$500,000 as part of a multiple parcel transaction. They have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$273,070. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report.

An exterior review from the street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property is not accurately depicted is not supported by any provided or available evidence. The total depreciation represents 40% of the building costs.

Given the claim of inaccurate recognition of deferred maintenance items impacting the valuation of the property, an inspection is necessary. We began the process of contacting the property owner's representatives on March 17, 2022 to schedule such an inspection. Despite numerous

requests over the last several weeks no inspection has been provided.

Without having an inspection, any specific condition information, and/or report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K. Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

NH Big Island Co., 263-178-1: The property owner filed an abatement request on their waterfront dwelling located on Big Island in the middle of Paugus Bay, with a street location known as Paugus Park Rd. The island is a private 1.95 acres in size and has 1,290 feet of frontage on Paugus Bay. It is improved with a seasonal camp building and extensive docks. The property was purchased in December of 2012 for \$750,000, and they have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$896,910. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report.

No inspection of the property has been completed in more than ten years. An exterior review from the shore was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property is not accurately depicted cannot be supported or refuted by any provided or available evidence.

Given the claim of inaccurate recognition of deferred maintenance items impacting the valuation of the property, an inspection is necessary. We began the process of contacting the property owner's representatives on March 17, 2022 to schedule such an inspection. Despite numerous requests over the last several weeks no inspection has been provided.

Without having an inspection, any specific condition information, and/or report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K. Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

Granting Hands LLC, 174-40-1: The property owner filed an abatement request on their waterfront dwelling located at 154 Channel Lane. This residential property is improved with a conventional style average grade building and has 50' of frontage on Paugus Bay. The property was purchased in September of 2016 for \$450,000, and they have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$448,420. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report.

Subsequent to the 2016 sale the property had been renovated under a building permit issued 3/3/2017. Two inspections of the property were completed following the renovations. An exterior review from the street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property is not accurately depicted is not supported by any provided or available evidence.

Given the claim of inaccurate recognition of deferred maintenance items impacting the valuation of the property, an inspection is necessary. We began the process of contacting the property owner's representatives on March 17, 2022 to schedule such an inspection. Despite numerous requests over the last several weeks no inspection has been provided.

Without having an inspection, any specific condition information, and/or report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K.

Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

Antaeus Holdings LTD, 367-495-6.1: The property owner filed an abatement request on this piece of vacant developable commercial land located at 15 Doris Ray Ct. This 1.41 acre property is unimproved and has 558 feet of frontage on Lake Opechee. The property was purchased in November of 2021 for a recorded consideration of \$500,000. They have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$117,250. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report.

An exterior review from the street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property is not accurately depicted is not supported by any provided or available evidence. The property has good access to Elm Street via a 50' shared access right of way. There is an easement in favor of Lakeport Hydroelectric that limits the full use of the site.

Given the claim of inaccurate recognition of deferred maintenance items impacting the valuation of the property, an inspection is necessary. We began the process of contacting the property owner's representatives on March 17, 2022 to schedule such an inspection. Despite numerous requests over the last several weeks no inspection has been provided.

Without having an inspection, any specific condition information, and/or report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K. Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

Antaeus Holdings LTD, 367-48-59: The property owner filed an abatement request on their single-family dwelling located at 59 Clinton Street. This residential property is improved with a conventional style building. The property was purchased in June of 2021 for a recorded consideration of \$185,000. They have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$112,840. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report.

An exterior review from the street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property is not accurately depicted is not supported by any provided or available evidence. The overall condition rating is fair, and the total depreciation represents 50% of the building costs.

Given the claim of inaccurate recognition of deferred maintenance items impacting the valuation of the property, an inspection is necessary. We began the process of contacting the property owner's representatives on March 17, 2022 to schedule such an inspection. Despite numerous requests over the last several weeks no inspection has been provided.

Without having an inspection, any specific condition information, and/or report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K. Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

Antaeus Holdings LTD, 367-100-49: The property owner filed an abatement request on their single-family dwelling located at 28 Harrison Street. This residential property is improved with a conventional style building. The property was purchased in December of 202 for a recorded

consideration of \$325,000. They have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$147,910. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report.

An exterior review from the street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property is not accurately depicted is not supported by any provided or available evidence. The overall condition rating is poor, and the total depreciation represents 60% of the building costs.

Given the claim of inaccurate recognition of deferred maintenance items impacting the valuation of the property, an inspection is necessary. We began the process of contacting the property owner's representatives on March 17, 2022 to schedule such an inspection. Despite numerous requests over the last several weeks no inspection has been provided.

Without having an inspection, any specific condition information, and/or report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K. Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

Antaeus Holdings LTD, 350-92-1: The property owner filed an abatement request on their small apartment building located at 171 Gold Street. This residential property is improved with a four-family building. The property was purchased in January of 2022 by an abutting property owner for a reported consideration of \$425,000 as part of the consolidation of ownership of multiple parcels. They have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$153,230. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report.

An exterior review from the street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property is not accurately depicted is not supported by any provided or available evidence. There is a significant (25%) functional deduction applied to the improvements, and total depreciation represents 65% of the building costs.

Given the claim of inaccurate recognition of deferred maintenance items impacting the valuation of the property, an inspection is necessary. We began the process of contacting the property owner's representatives on March 17, 2022 to schedule such an inspection. Despite numerous requests over the last several weeks no inspection has been provided.

Without having an inspection, any specific condition information, and/or report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K. Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

Antaeus Holdings LTD, 350-21-23: The property owner filed an abatement request on their vacant lot located on Belvidere Street. This property has no improvements except a dock and is located directly on Paugus Bay. The property was purchased in March of 2021 as part of a multi-parcel transaction. They have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$28,840. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report.

No inspection of the property has been completed in more than ten years. A review from the

street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property is not accurately depicted cannot be supported or refuted by any provided or available evidence, and is inapplicable to this vacant piece of land.

Without having any specific report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K. Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

Antaeus Holdings LTD, 350-21-2: The property owner filed an abatement request on their two-family dwelling located at 12 Belvidere Street. This residential property is improved with a duplex style building located directly across from Paugus Bay with water views. The property was purchased in March of 2021 as part of a multi-parcel transaction. They have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$123,690. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report.

Subsequent to the 2021 sale the property had been renovated under a building permit issued 4/5/2021. Two inspections of the property were completed following the renovations. An exterior review from the street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property is not accurately depicted is not supported by any provided or available evidence.

Given the claim of inaccurate recognition of deferred maintenance items impacting the valuation of the property, an inspection is necessary. We began the process of contacting the property owner's representatives on March 17, 2022 to schedule such an inspection. Despite numerous requests over the last several weeks no inspection has been provided.

Without having an inspection, any specific condition information, and/or report or analysis to support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K. Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

Antaeus Holdings LTD, 215-266-11: The property owner filed an abatement request on their waterfront dwelling located at 112 Prescott Ave. This residential property is improved with a seasonal camp building and 965 square foot boathouse and has 681' of frontage on Paugus Bay. The property was purchased in September of 2020 for \$1,250,000, and they have expressed the opinion that the market value of the property is \$834,960. The market value estimate is a conclusory statement unsupported by any evidence or report.

Subsequent to the 2020 sale the property had been renovated under a building permit issued 3/31/2021. Two inspections of the property were completed following the renovations. An exterior review from the street was completed by Mr. Hamilton on 5/5/2022. The general statement contained in the abatement application that total depreciation for the property is not accurately depicted is not supported by any provided or available evidence.

Given the claim of inaccurate recognition of deferred maintenance items impacting the valuation of the property, an inspection is necessary. We began the process of contacting the property owner's representatives on March 17, 2022 to schedule such an inspection. Despite numerous requests over the last several weeks no inspection has been provided.

Without having an inspection, any specific condition information, and/or report or analysis to

support the estimate of market value provided, it is recommended that no abatement is appropriate at this time. J. Rice made a motion to deny the request for abatement, second by K. Mudgett. The motion passed unanimously.

NON-PUBLIC: L. Miner made a motion that the Board enter a non-public session to discuss matters that could adversely affect the reputation of the applicant according to RSA 91-a:3IIc. K. Mudgett second, a roll call vote was taken, vote unanimous, and a non-public session was entered into at 5:34 p.m. J. Rice made a motion to return out of non-public session at 5:46 p.m. and K. Mudgett seconded. A roll call vote was taken, vote unanimous.

256 Country Club Rd. 475-215-17: The matter was tabled due to additional documentation needed.

91 Sheridan St., 345-198-24: The matter was tabled due to additional documentation needed.

41 Mass Av., 329-148-21 The board voted to grant the request on a motion made by L. Miner and second by J. Rice. The motion passed unanimously.

OTHER

Timber Tax warrants were signed.
Land Use Change Tax forms were reviewed and signed.
Real Estate Tax warrant was signed.

ADJOURNMENT: L. Miner made a motion to adjourn, seconded by K. Mudgett. The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Submitted by: _____
Tara Baker, BOA Clerk