

**THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF THE COUNTY OF DOUGLAS, COLORADO**

**RESOLUTION REGARDING THE ABATEMENT APPEAL OF MARC ANTHONY
AND JULIA SENIW, ABATEMENT NO. 16-210.**

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution No. R-008-083, A Resolution Appointing Independent Referees to Conduct Abatement Hearings on Behalf of the Board of County Commissioners Beginning July 1, 2008, the Board finds as follows:

1. On July 13, 2017, Referee Karen Smith heard the abatement petition of Marc Anthony and Julia Seniw (the Petitioners), Abatement No. 16-210; and
2. After hearing all the evidence, Referee Smith made the recommendations contained in the attached Referee Worksheet for Abatement Number 16-210;
3. Prior to the regular Business Meeting of the Board of County Commissioners ("Board") on September 26, 2017, the Petitioner had requested that the Board re-examine this appeal. Based on this request and having reviewed the information provided, the Board directs the following:

The abatement petition of Marc Anthony and Julia Seniw, Abatement No. 16-210, is granted/~~denied~~ and the value shall be: \$350,000.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Douglas, State of Colorado, that the Board orders the Clerk to the Board to prepare a resolution for Marc Anthony and Julia Seniw, Abatement No. 16-210, indicating the Board's final decision in this matter.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 14th day of November, 2017 in Castle Rock, Douglas County, Colorado.

**THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF THE COUNTY OF DOUGLAS, COLORADO**

BY: Roger A. Partridge
ROGER A. PARTRIDGE, Chair

ATTEST: Emily Wrenn
EMILY WRENN, Deputy Clerk



DOUGLAS COUNTY ABATEMENT HEARING
REFEREE WORKSHEET

Petitioner: Marc Anthony Seniw

Agent: Julia Seniw

Property Address: 14275 Westcreek Road, Sedalia, CO

Abatement Number: 16-210

Assessor's Original Value: R0474144: \$4,429; R0474143: \$17,888; R0150199: \$466,280
Tax year 2015

Hearing Date: July 13, 2017

Hearing Time: 9:00 a.m.

1. The Douglas County Assessor was represented at the hearing by Beth Willcox and Taylor Lindt

2. The Petitioner was:

- a. ☒ present
- b. ☐ not present
- c. ☐ present/represented by
- d. ☐ not present/represented by

3. Assessor's Recommended Value: R0474144: \$4,429; R0474143: \$17,888; R0150199: \$357,683
Tax year 2015

Petitioner's Requested Value: \$317,000 total for all 3 parcels for tax year 2015

4. Petitioner presented the following testimony and documents in support of the claim: Petitioner submitted a listing history for the subject property, comparable sales and equalization comparables. Petitioner testified that the subject property is a two-bedroom house built as a caretaker's house having a kitchen and bathroom on the first floor and the bedrooms on the second floor; the subject property is located in the Hayman fire burn area and sold for \$317,000 on 11/1/2013 and then resold to the Petitioner for \$325,000 on 10/10/2014; four of the Assessor's comparable sales are larger properties located outside the Hayman fire burn area; Petitioner's equalization comparables support a lower value for land than was placed on the subject property; Petitioner's comparable sales support a lower value for the building.

5. The Assessor presented the following testimony and documents in support of the Assessor's position:

- a. ☒ data from sales of comparable properties which sold during the applicable time period; and /or
- b. ☐ valuation using the cost approach; and/or
- c. ☐ a valuation using the income approach; and/or
- d. ☒ other All of Petitioner's equalization comparables were agricultural land; Petitioner's comparable sales were smaller or older buildings on smaller parcels of land.

THE REFEREE FINDS AND RECOMMENDS THAT THE PROPER CLASSIFICATION AND ACTUAL VALUE OF THE PROPERTY ARE:

Classification: Vacant land and residential

Total Actual Value: R0474144: \$4,429; R0474143: \$17,888; R0150199: \$327,683
Tax year 2015

Reasons are as follows: Comparable sales indicate a reduction to actual value is appropriate.

IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED that for the above-stated reasons, the Petition for Abatement is:

- a. ☐ Approved and the value of the subject property is reduced as set forth in the Findings and Recommendations herein
- b. ☒ Approved in part as set forth in the Findings and Recommendations herein
- c. ☐ Denied after abatement hearing
- d. ☐ Administrative Denial is Granted

REFEREE:

s/ Karen Smith
Name

July 13, 2017
Date

Abatement Log No. 16-210