Town of Fayston
Lister's Office
866 North Fayston Road | Fayston VT 05660

2024 Grievance Hearings
Wednesday June 5, 2024
5:00 p.m. to 7:00pm via Zoom and at the Robert Vasseur Town Hall

Listers in attendance: Doug Mosle, Kirsten Savage,
Others: Michelle Leibowitz, Eastman Long, Laura Colicchio, Charles Martin (via zoom)

Grievance hearings opened at 5pm

06-001 – Martin, Charles (via Zoom)
Mr. Martin wanted to make sure we understood the nature of their project. They have built a second home but the old home will be partially torn down and eventually connected to the new home when completed. He wanted to know if this was taken into consideration when evaluating the property. Doug explained that the assessed value reflects the condition of the property as of April 1, 2024 and that on that date the old home had not been torn down and the new home was being occupied. Doug further explained that when work commences on the old home, they could notify us when that work was complete and we could schedule another visit at a time convenient to them. At any rate we will plan another visit for the fall and again in the spring if the work is ongoing. Mr. Martin indicated he thought the work would be done by winter.

14-006 – Leibowitz, Michelle
Ms. Leibowitz questioned the percentage complete (97%) calculated by the Listers. Her home is an existing home that has been gutted to the studs and rebuilt. The Listers visited the home in early April and noted that the interior is complete, the home's layout is more functional than the original home, but that the exterior was still incomplete, which accounted for the 3% incomplete. Ms. Leibowitz stated that the exterior was not just incomplete but that due to damage and exposure all siding must be removed and replaced and that there are windows that are not trimmed, some of the siding is missing, the decks have been removed, there are no walkways, steps, seeding or finish work in the yard.

7-026 – Long, Eastman
Mr. Long believed that the listers increased the value of his property by $9,100 and asked what had changed that increased his value by so much. Doug explained that the increase was not in the Real Value of the property but in the Homestead value. This increase is consistent with the value of the Outbuilding on the property which has historically been declared as Business Use (non-homestead value). When this year's HS 122 was filed, no business use of the outbuilding was declared, so the property shows a Homestead increase for the same value. Mr. Long did not remember if he had filed the HS 122 or his accountant, but agreed that it might have been a mistake by the accountant. He asked what affect this might have on his taxes, which the listers discussed with him briefly. Ultimately Doug suggested that he contact his accountant and that it was probably not too late to make a correction before tax bills go out.

06-016 Colicchio, Laura

Mrs. Colicchio questioned the value placed upon her property by the listers stating that the house is not conducive to occupancy. She indicated that the 74% complete is inaccurate as there is no septic, no plumbing, no electricity, the roof is incomplete, there are no appliances or toilets at all. Furthermore, the driveway is in poor shape, the grounds require extensive machine work and landscaping, and that altogether the cost of the kit that the builder is constructing was $160,000. She also believes that the Listers assumed that this is a 4-bedroom home which it is not. She asked how the listers currently assessed the property. Doug responded that the listers had reached out via email three times between February and April requesting access to the property for the purpose of updating our records. Mr. Colicchio had responded to the first email stating that he would not allow us on the property due to liability. None of the subsequent requests, all made in writing, were responded to. Doug explained that he made the assessment based upon the best information he could obtain, which amounted taking photos from the road, comparing them to photos and info from a year ago and utilizing any public records available indicating any progress that may have been made. Doug explained that during his communication with Mr. Colicchio he had told Mr. Colicchio that observations from the road amounted to guessing at value and that it was not an accurate or fair approach to fair Market Evaluation. No response was received to that communication either. Mrs. Colicchio felt that the methodology for assessing their property was inaccurate, which Doug agreed with. Doug indicated that if the Listers were able to visit the property they could provide a much more accurate assessment. Mrs. Colicchio agreed to meet Doug at the property at noon the following day, June 6th.

6-051-001 – Playter, Joy

Mrs. Playter sent an email that indicated that she felt that the Fair Market Value that the Listers have placed on the land excluded from Current Use is unfair because they agreed to never develop this land when they purchased it. The email also references a conversation with Doug Mosle about this last summer in which she believed that this was a legal deed restriction "but she would check". Although Doug did not hear back from Mrs. Playter about the Deed, he did follow up and review the deed, which does state that this lower lot cannot be developed. The 3.8 acres in question is assessed in the Bulk Land Schedule for around $3,500/acre, but for the purpose of Use Value Appraisal as a standalone parcel, the 3.8-acre lower parcel is assessed at $89,000. The request by Mrs. Playter is to reduce the value so that the fair market value as a standalone parcel for the purpose of Current Use reflects that it is restricted from further development by deed.

At 7:15 pm on June 5, 2024 the Grievance hearings were continued to June 13, 2024 at 5pm, to allow for site visits and deliberation.

2024 Grievance Hearings Continued
Thursday June 13, 2024
5:00 pm via Zoom and at the Robert Vasseur Town Hall

Listers in attendance: Doug Mosle, Kirsten Savage (via zoom), Kim Laidlaw
Others: Edward O'Connor (via zoom)

Grievance Hearings continued at 5:00 pm

07-073 – O'Connor, Edward (Ned)
Mr. O'Connor appeared before the board to discuss the assessed value of his carriage house on Marble Hill Rd. He stated that he was quite taken aback by the valuation assessed to his property and feels that his assessment does not reflect a price he could sell the house and land for. He feels that if his carriage house is assessed this high there is no way he can afford to build his home here and will not be able to retire in Vermont. He discussed two properties which he stated were larger and also post/beam that were assessed at lower total values. The properties were 7-043 & 03-032001. Doug noted that the parcel located at 7-043 had similar square footage for the home and was assessed about the same, excluding the land value, which is significant for the Subject Parcel at 29+ acres. Doug asked if he felt that $134/square foot seems high, low or about right and Ned responded that he could never build it for that but that if he could get that for it now he would take that deal immediately (sic). He also stated that he felt our square footage was incorrect because we did not account for stairwells and utility rooms and the interior was smaller than the exterior. Doug explained that we assess all developed space including the full footprint of the house and the exterior walls. Doug asked if Ned had anything else to add. There were no further questions.

Entered deliberative session at 5:18pm
Exited deliberative session at 5:57pm
Grievance Hearings closed at 6:00pm

Results of Grievance

- **06-001** – No change in value. Listers agreed that at the time of inspection the old home was intact and the assessment reflected the condition of the property on 4/1/24.
- **14-006** – Appraised Value reduced from $400,300 to $379,600. This reflected incomplete work noted by the homeowner and confirmed by the listers.
- **07-026** – No change in value. Listers confirmed that homestead increase reflected the HS 122 declaration made by the property owner.
- **06-016** – Appraised Value reduced from $415,000 to $353,300. This reflected a review of the property that included a site visit and interior inspection on June 6, 2024.
- **06-051-001** – Current Use Value of the Excluded Land reduced from $370,800 to $305,900. Current Use Exemption increased from $121,500 to $186,400.
- **07-073** – Appraised value reduced from $486,500 to 467,900.

Respectfully submitted,

Doug Mosle, Kirsten Savage, Kim Laidlaw

Fayston Listers
June 13, 2024