

Ms. Hyatt,

Your article in today's paper "Tax appeal stirs discontent with revaluation" has incorrect information I thought you should be aware of. Perhaps you did not understand our appeal. Today an individual stated "It is a terrible injustice to the taxpayers in this county when a story such as this is not reported accurately."

Following are a few observations from your article.

You stated "The owners wanted it valued at \$148,000..." This is false.

I believe you have a copy of the Property Tax Commission ruling which states "Appellants contend that the value of the subject property was \$165,232 as of January 1, 2011..." For clarification, the 2011 value we requested was \$165,232, not \$148,000 as you reported.

Your article is totally off kilter due to the incorrect value you claimed we wanted. Throughout the article you indicate the value was reduced about halfway between what the county established and what we requested. Those statements are false.

The state commission did not split anything; the value was not "reduced halfway between what the county established and what we requested." The state ruled in our favor and reduced our property close to the amount we requested.

You also stated "...The revaluation cost was estimated at \$750,000..."

During the August 19, 2013 county commissioners meeting our tax collector/administrator was asked the following, "What was the cost of our last revaluation?..." Francis indicated the last revaluation cost around "\$400 and some thousand" which included redesigning the computer program and neighborhood delineation. Another reval may be less.

Some observations from your September 2nd article titled "Critics: Values are too high" are as follows:

You stated "Since the new values took effect on Jan. 1, 2012" (that should read 2011) "the sales ratios have been hovering at the 100 percent level, indicating the sales and appraised values of the properties are in sync, as is the goal..."

Later you quoted Jim Blyth "We're not pricing anything in the assessed value range. It's too low," he said of property his company, Elk Country Realty lists."

If Blyth is listing property assessed too low, someone else has property assessed too high, otherwise the appraised vs. market values would not be "in sync."

I searched Elk Country Realty to look at the properties Blyth had listed. I found "This site is currently under construction" under "listings." I believe this site has been under construction for quite some time if my memory serves me correct.

Would you please send me a link to the properties Blyth spoke of?

Regarding appraised vs. market values, Brian Cagle, was quoted as saying "...he's found some variance between the two in certain pockets of the county..." What "pockets" is Cagle referring too?

Some of the comments made serve to solidify my position regarding certain home owners being overtaxed.

If you recall an in depth study was done in 2011 with data that was furnished by Francis. The study showed many lower price homes were selling significantly lower than the assessed values and many higher priced homes were selling higher than the assessed values.

Although countywide the appraised vs. market values may be in line, I believe there are pockets that are assessed too high.

Lastly, you stated "...The most recent data for 2013 shows sales are at 103 percent of assessed value, **meaning property is selling for slightly more than the market value** established two years ago..."

David Francis is quoted in the March 4, 2013 Haywood County commissioner meeting minutes as saying:

"...For 2012, the ratio was 102%, **meaning that sales were slightly below tax value...**"

It is my understanding that number has changed to 103% for 2013.

In essence you are saying the property is selling for 3% more than the county tax value, while the tax collector / administrator indicates homes are selling 3% below the tax value.

The correct information should have been reported to the taxpayers and your readers.

Denny King