

**KITTITAS COUNTY
BOARD OF EQUALIZATION**

411 N Ruby St, Ste 2, Ellensburg, WA 98926
(509) 962-7506

ORDER OF THE KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

Property Owner(s): Jeremy Thompson

Mailing Address: 1103 N Cora St
 Ellensburg, WA 98926

Tax Parcel No(s): 113133

Assessment Year: 2023 (Taxes Payable in 2024)

Petition Number: BE-23-0308

Having considered the evidence presented by the parties in this appeal, the Board hereby:
Sustained
the determination of the Assessor.

Assessor's Determination

Assessor's Land: \$110,220
Assessor's Improvement: \$191,610
TOTAL: \$301,830

Board of Equalization (BOE) Determination


BOE Land: \$110,220
BOE Improvement: \$191,610
TOTAL: \$301,830

Those in attendance at the hearing and findings:

See attached Recommendation and Proposed Decision of the Hearing Examiner.

Hearing Held On : January 18, 2024
Decision Entered On: February 6, 2024
Hearing Examiner: Ann Shaw

Date Mailed: 2/12/24



Chairperson (of Authorized Designee)



Clerk of the Board of Equalization

NOTICE OF APPEAL

This order can be appealed to the State Board of Tax Appeals by filing a Notice of Appeal with them at PO Box 40915, Olympia, WA 98504-0915, within THIRTY days of the date of mailing on this Order (RCW 84.08.130). The Notice of Appeal form is available from the Washington State Board of Tax Appeals or the Kittitas County Board of Equalization Clerk.

KITTITAS COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION- PROPOSED RECOMMENDATION

Appellants: Jeremy Thompson
Petition: BE-23-0308
Parcel: 113133
Address: 1103 N Cora St

Hearing: January 18,2024 10:12 A.M.

Present at hearing: Jeremy Thompson, Appellant; Dana Glenn , Appraiser; Jessica Miller, BOE Clerk; Ann Shaw, Hearing Examiner

Testimony given: Jeremy Thompson and Dana Glenn

Assessor's determination:
Land: \$110,220
Improvements: \$191,610
Total: \$301,830

Taxpayer's estimate:
Land: \$110,220
Improvements: \$165,000
Total: \$275,220

SUMMATION OF EVIDENCE PRESENTED AND FINDING OF FACT:

This parcel is 9600 Square Foot Lot with a 1,739 Square Foot Home on it which was built in 1880.

The petitioner gave information about the quality of the home and concerns about the construction methods. They have done a little since purchasing for \$255,000 in 2021 such as partial residing, shoring up of the front porch and adding a shed and basketball court. The petitioner is concerned about the value given to the shed of \$6,650 and the concrete slab of \$4,420. The petitioner said the upstairs windows are all aluminum windows and the neighbors store trash in the backyard.

The assessor's representative said that he has a record that the heat source has improved since the purchase and the petitioner agreed that that had been done. There are still siding issues, the roof is at its useful life, and the foundation is uneven.

The assessor's representative discussed the sales and market data to support the value.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

"Upon review by any court, or appellate body, of a determination of the valuation of property for purposes of taxation, it shall be presumed that the determination of the public official charged with the

duty of establishing such value is correct, but this presumption shall not be a defense against any correction indicated by clear, cogent and convincing evidence.” RCW 81.40.0301

In other words, the assessor’s determination of property value shall be presumed correct. The petitioner can overcome this presumption that the assessor’s value is correct only by presenting clear, cogent and convincing evidence otherwise.

“All real property in this state subject to taxation shall be listed and assessed every year, with reference to its value on the first day of January of the year in which it is assessed...”
RCW 84.40.020

“The true and fair value of real property for taxation purposes...must be based upon the following criteria:

- (a) Any sales of the property being appraised or similar properties with respect to sales made within the past five years...
- (b) In addition to sales as defined in subsection (3)(a) of this section, consideration may be given to cost, cost less depreciation, reconstruction cost less depreciation, or capitalization of income that would be derived from prudent use of the property, as limited by law or ordinance...”

RCW 84.40.030(3)

“(1) In making its decision with respect to the value of property, the board shall use the criteria set forth in RCW 84.40.030.

(2) Parties may submit and boards may consider any sales of the subject property or similar properties which occurred prior to the hearing date so long as the requirements of RCW 84.40.030, 84.48.150, and WAC 458-14-066 are complied with. Only sales made within five years of the date of the petition shall be considered.

(3) Any sale of property prior to or after January 1st of the year of revaluation shall be adjusted to its value as of January 1 of the year of evaluation, reflecting market activity and using generally accepted appraisal methods...

(4) More weight shall be given to similar sales occurring closest to the assessment date which require the fewest adjustments for characteristics.”

WAC 458-14-087

RECOMMENDATION:

The Hearing Examiner has determined that the appellant has not met the burden of proof to overturn the Assessed Value of the property with clear, cogent, and convincing evidence.


Market sales were not provided to support a change in value.

Every finding of fact this is a conclusion of law shall be deemed as such. Every conclusion of law that contains a finding of fact shall be deemed as a finding of fact.

PROPOSED DECISION:

The Examiner proposes that the Kittitas County Board of Equalization uphold the assessed value.

DATED 1/18/24


Ann Shaw, Hearing Examiner