Notice of Board of Review Determination

Under state law (sec. 70.47(12), Wis. Stats.), your property assessment for the current year 20_19 as finalized by the Board of Review (BOR) is listed below.

Property owner Irvin Hougom 105 7th St. S. La Crosse, WI 54601	General information Date issued 6 - 5 - 2019 Parcel no. 17-20177-100 Address 105 7th St. S. Legal description
	☐ Town ☐ Village ☒ City Municipality La Crosse

20 <u>19</u> Origin	nal Assessm	nent		al Assessme ined by BOR)	∍nt
Land	\$	173,300	Land	\$	173,300
Improvements	\$	80,400	Improvements	\$.	80,400
Personal property	\$		Personal property	\$	
Personal property	\$		Personal property	\$	
Personal property	\$	" • •	Personal property	\$	
Total personal property	\$		Total personal property	\$	
Total all property	\$	253,700	Total all property	\$	253,700

Appeal information

If you are not satisfied with the BOR's decision, there are appeal options available. **Note:** Each appeal option has filing requirements. For more information on the appeal process, review the Property Assessment Appeal Guide. Visit <u>revenue.wi.gov</u> and search keyword "Assessment Appeal."

Appeal to:

Department of Revenue (DOR) – must file within 20 days after receipt of the BOR's determination notice or within 30 days after the date specified on the affidavit if there is no return receipt. A \$100 filing fee is required. The fair market value of the items or parcels cannot exceed \$1 million dollars. DOR may revalue the property any time before November 1 of the assessment year or within 60 days after receiving the appeal, whichever is later. If adjusted, the value is substituted for the original value and taxes paid accordingly. (sec. 70.85, Wis. Stats.)

Circuit Court - Action for Certiorari – must file within 90 days after receiving the determination notice. The Court decides based on the written record from the BOR. You cannot submit new evidence. (sec. 70.47(13), Wis. Stats.)

Municipality - Excessive Assessment - must first appeal to the BOR and have not appealed the BOR's decision to Circuit Court or to DOR. You cannot claim an excessive assessment under sec. 74.37, Wis. Stats., unless the tax is timely paid. A claim under section 74.37 must be filed with the municipality by January 31 of the year the tax is payable.

		÷			
•					
	·				
				÷	
			•		
	•	•			
					·
•					
		•			
·					
	•				

City of La Crosse Board of Review Findings of Fact, Determinations and Decision

A. PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT

	· ·	
Ass	essment Year: 2019	Tax Key Number: 17-20177-100
I	Personal Property Account Number(If applicable)	
	Property Address:	105 7th St. S.
	Property Owner:	Irvin Hougom
	Mailing Address:	105 7th St. S.
Janu	ary 1, 20 19 Assessm	nent Value: 253,700
Lanc	1: 173,300	Improvements: 80,400 Total: 253,700
Hear	ring Date: June 3, 2019	Time: 4:20 p.m.
Obje	ector Received written conf	irmation of Hearing Date: Yes: No: (OR)
Both	Objector and Assessor wa	ived 48-hour notice of hearing: Yes: No:
	{Note: Taxpayer	must have filed written objection before or at Board of Review}
Chec	ck one of the following:	
図		File an Objection" was provided by objector to clerk (either in writing or ior to first full session of Board of Review (OR)
	Waiver was granted by Bo	pard of Review for:
	Good Cause <u>or</u>	
	☐ Extraordinary Circums	tances
	d members present:	
Nick	k Passe, Dan Ryan, Ken	na Christians, Mike Brown, Susan Dillenbeck

Board members removed (if any):				•	
		·			
Board Counsel present:					

Property Owner/Objector's					
Attorney or Representative: Board Members with certified training (in	niet have at	least one)			
Nick Passe, Mike Brown, Susan I					
THE BIOTHY Susuit		•			
. ,					
3. TESTIMONY					
	witnesses b	v the Board of Review	v Clerk {includ	le Property	
The following individuals were sworn as Owner/Objector (or his/her representative			(1111)		
The following individuals were sworn as Owner/Objector (or his/her representative Patrick Burns, Irvin Hougom					
Owner/Objector (or his/her representative					
Owner/Objector (or his/her representative Patrick Burns, Irvin Hougom	e, if testifyin	g) and Assessor}:		TOO ARAA SITTAAN TISIA AY	
Owner/Objector (or his/her representative Patrick Burns, Irvin Hougom 1. Sworn testimony by Property Owner	e, if testifyin	g) and Assessor}: Irvin Hougom		included	*
Owner/Objector (or his/her representative Patrick Burns, Irvin Hougom 1. Sworn testimony by Property Owner 1) A recent sale of the subject property:	r/Objector:	g) and Assessor}: Irvin Hougom No:		gran	•
Owner/Objector (or his/her representative Patrick Burns, Irvin Hougom 1. Sworn testimony by Property Owner	r/Objector:	g) and Assessor}: Irvin Hougom		gran	•
Owner/Objector (or his/her representative Patrick Burns, Irvin Hougom 1. Sworn testimony by Property Owner 1) A recent sale of the subject property:	r/Objector: Yes: \[\] \	g) and Assessor}: Irvin Hougom No: 🗹		gran	*
Owner/Objector (or his/her representative Patrick Burns, Irvin Hougom 1. Sworn testimony by Property Owner a) A recent sale of the subject property: If yes: The subject property was sold for	r/Objector: Yes: \[\] N	g) and Assessor}: Irvin Hougom No: 🗹	Date	gran	:
Dwner/Objector (or his/her representative Patrick Burns, Irvin Hougom 1. Sworn testimony by Property Owner a) A recent sale of the subject property: If yes: The subject property was sold for b) Recent sales of comparable properties If yes: A total number of	r/Objector: Yes: \[\] N	g) and Assessor}: Irvin Hougom No: O: O:	Date	gran	•
Dwner/Objector (or his/her representative Patrick Burns, Irvin Hougom 1. Sworn testimony by Property Owner a) A recent sale of the subject property: If yes: The subject property was sold for b) Recent sales of comparable properties	r/Objector: Yes: \[\] N	g) and Assessor}: Irvin Hougom No: O: O:	Date	gran	•
Dwner/Objector (or his/her representative Patrick Burns, Irvin Hougom 1. Sworn testimony by Property Owner a) A recent sale of the subject property: If yes: The subject property was sold for b) Recent sales of comparable properties If yes: A total number of	r/Objector: Yes: \[\] N	g) and Assessor}: Irvin Hougom No: O: O:	Date	gran	•
Dwner/Objector (or his/her representative Patrick Burns, Irvin Hougom 1. Sworn testimony by Property Owner a) A recent sale of the subject property: If yes: The subject property was sold for b) Recent sales of comparable properties If yes: A total number of	r/Objector: Yes: \[\] N	g) and Assessor}: Irvin Hougom No: O: O:	Date	gran	•

Over two years ago, assessment increased; last year I didn't protest. After another increase of \$29,000, thought I needed to speak up. Average square foot cost downtown is \$20/sq. ft. Don't mind paying close to average. Buried fuel tanks in front yard. A prospective buyer will not consider buried fuel tanks as a positive, and city will probably require them to be removed. Feels that should be credited. If average is \$20/sq. ft., should have a credit. New proposal would have it at \$23/sq. ft. Been there since 2005. Bought it in 2009 for \$250,000 - negotiated with them for a land contract and felt we overpaid. When we analyzed the cost for another move we felt it was justified to overpay. \$230,000 is more than fair for the assessment of the property. One negative is exiting onto Main St. because it is close to the corner and dangerous.

	 		- -
		· ·	
Summary of testimony	of other witnesses f	or objector (if any):	
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		•	
3. Sworn testimony by A			included:
 a) Estimated level of ass 	essment for the curre	ent year is 100 %	
b) A recent sale of the su	ibject property:	Yes: ☑ No: □	
If yes: The subject prope	erty was sold for $$25$	50,000	Date of sale 3/24/2010
c) Recent sales of compa	arable properties:	Yes: 🗹 No: 🗌	
If yes: A total number of Addresses of other prope		properties were presented:	
1825 Sunset Ln.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
122 7th St. S. 712 La Crosse St.			
2216 State Rd. 16			

If yes: List of summary factors or reasons presented by Assessor::

Stated credentials. Reviewed the cost and income approach for this property, as listed in the Report for the Board. Market Value Detail page of land value after depreciation is \$57.40/sq. ft. for an overall assessed value of \$253,700. The next page is the Market Approach. Made adjustments for locations, condition, functions, steps for a value of \$250,400. Last page was Income Approach, with a value of \$257,556. He does not know of another downtown location with fuel tanks. As far as the effects of tanks filled with sand, as long as new structure is not built on it, the property would be usable as is. City would not be involved in a private matter to pull the tanks. If footings and foundation were going over the tanks, they would have to be removed. Corner lots that have traffic lights demand a higher sell price 25-100%, depending on location and traffic patterns, and based on condition of property, market sales and income throughout the community. There are other parcels that have underground obstacles and adjustments are made for those because they are massive. In this case, they would need to be removed if a structure was in place.

Summary of testimony of other	er witnesses for assessor (if any):	

C. DETERMINATIONS

	e assessor's estimated level of assessment* of the municipality has been	determined to be
100	%	
2. Th	e Board of Review finds that there was a recent sale of the subject prop	erty: Yes: ☑ No: □
a)	The sale was an arm's-length transaction. Yes: Yes:	No: \square
b)	The sale was representative of the value as of January 1 Yes: Yes:	No: 🗆
c)	The Board finds that the sale supports the assessment. Yes: 🗹	No: □
d)	If all answers are 'yes':	
	d1. What is the sale price? \$250,000	
	d2. What if any adjustments, based on the evidence presented, should be as time between the date of sale and the January 1 assessment date, non-reselling price (ag-use value and fractionally assessed classes), and/or other occurred to the property between the sale date and the January 1 assessment date.	narket class value in the rphysical changes that
	,	
	d3. What is the full market value? \$253,700	
T.C		
all the * The	ponses in 2 through 2c were "yes", upon completion of the section, proceed at apply and determine the assessed value. The relationship between the assessed value and the equalized value of non-mass corrections for prior year over or under charges within a municipality-to-the sections.	nanufacturing property
all the * The minu. exam equal	ponses in 2 through 2c were "yes", upon completion of the section, proceed at apply and determine the assessed value. e relationship between the assessed value and the equalized value of non-n	nanufacturing property own, city, or village. For cipality is \$2,700,000 and th
all the * The minu, exam equal to be	ponses in 2 through 2c were "yes", upon completion of the section, proceed at apply and determine the assessed value. The relationship between the assessed value and the equalized value of non-mess corrections for prior year over or under charges within a municipality—to the assessed value of all property subject to property tax in the municipality of value (with no prior corrections) in the municipality is \$3,000,000 the	nanufacturing property own, city, or village. For cipality is \$2,700,000 and th on the assessment level is sai
* The minu. exam equal to be	ponses in 2 through 2c were "yes", upon completion of the section, proceed at apply and determine the assessed value. The relationship between the assessed value and the equalized value of non-mets corrections for prior year over or under charges within a municipality-taple if the assessed value of all property subject to property tax in the municipality value (with no prior corrections) in the municipality is \$3,000,000 the \$90% (\$2,700,000/\$3,000,000 = .90 or 90%).	nanufacturing property own, city, or village. For cipality is \$2,700,000 and th on the assessment level is sai
* The minu. exam equal to be	ponses in 2 through 2c were "yes", upon completion of the section, proceed at apply and determine the assessed value. The relationship between the assessed value and the equalized value of non-most corrections for prior year over or under charges within a municipality—to the assessed value of all property subject to property tax in the municipal value (with no prior corrections) in the municipality is \$3,000,000 the 90% (\$2,700,000/\$3,000,000 = .90 or 90%). The Board of Review finds that there are recent sales of comparable property.	nanufacturing property own, city, or village. For cipality is \$2,700,000 and th on the assessment level is sai
* The minu, exam, equal to be 3. Th If Yes Prope a) Dio	ponses in 2 through 2c were "yes", upon completion of the section, proceed at apply and determine the assessed value. The relationship between the assessed value and the equalized value of non-mass corrections for prior year over or under charges within a municipality—to the assessed value of all property subject to property tax in the municipal value (with no prior corrections) in the municipality is \$3,000,000 the 90% (\$2,700,000/\$3,000,000 = .90 or 90%). The Board of Review finds that there are recent sales of comparable property, answer the following:	nanufacturing property own, city, or village. For cipality is \$2,700,000 and th on the assessment level is sai
* The minus example example example to be 3. The Prope a) Dioprope b) If y	ponses in 2 through 2c were "yes", upon completion of the section, proceed at apply and determine the assessed value. The relationship between the assessed value and the equalized value of non-mass corrections for prior year over or under charges within a municipality—to the assessed value of all property subject to property tax in the municipal value (with no prior corrections) in the municipality is \$3,000,000 the 90% (\$2,700,000/\$3,000,000 = .90 or 90%). The Board of Review finds that there are recent sales of comparable property Owner The Comparable property Owner present testimony of recent sales of comparable	nanufacturing property own, city, or village. For cipality is \$2,700,000 and th en the assessment level is sai erties: Yes: \[\] No: \[\]
* The minus example example example to be 3. The Prope a) Dioprope b) If you	ponses in 2 through 2c were "yes", upon completion of the section, proceed at apply and determine the assessed value. The relationship between the assessed value and the equalized value of non-mass corrections for prior year over or under charges within a municipality—to the assessed value of all property subject to property tax in the municipal value (with no prior corrections) in the municipality is \$3,000,000 the 90% (\$2,700,000/\$3,000,000 = .90 or 90%). The Board of Review finds that there are recent sales of comparable property Owner determined the Property Owner present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the market area: The week of the property of the attributes satisfactorily adjusted for their differences from the ct and their contribution to value?	nanufacturing property own, city, or village. For cipality is \$2,700,000 and th en the assessment level is sai erties: Yes: \[\] No: \[\] Yes: \[\] No: \[\]
* The minu. exam, equal to be 3. The Prope a) Dic prope b) If you subject Assess c) Dic	ponses in 2 through 2c were "yes", upon completion of the section, proceed at apply and determine the assessed value. The relationship between the assessed value and the equalized value of non-mass corrections for prior year over or under charges within a municipality—to the assessed value of all property subject to property tax in the municipal value (with no prior corrections) in the municipality is \$3,000,000 the 90% (\$2,700,000/\$3,000,000 = .90 or 90%). The Board of Review finds that there are recent sales of comparable property Owner determined the Property Owner present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the market area: The week of the property of the attributes satisfactorily adjusted for their differences from the ct and their contribution to value?	nanufacturing property own, city, or village. For cipality is \$2,700,000 and th en the assessment level is sai erties: Yes: \[\] No: \[\] Yes: \[\] No: \[\]
* The minus example example example example to be 3. The House example exampl	ponses in 2 through 2c were "yes", upon completion of the section, proceed at apply and determine the assessed value. The relationship between the assessed value and the equalized value of non-mass corrections for prior year over or under charges within a municipality—to the property the assessed value of all property subject to property tax in the municipality devalue (with no prior corrections) in the municipality is \$3,000,000 the 90% (\$2,700,000/\$3,000,000 = .90 or 90%). The Board of Review finds that there are recent sales of comparable property Owner depends on the following: The property Owner present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the market area: The yes, were the attributes satisfactorily adjusted for their differences from the cent and their contribution to value? The Assessor present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the Assessor present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the Assessor present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the Assessor present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the Assessor present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the Assessor present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the Assessor present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the Assessor present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the Assessor present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the Assessor present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the Assessor present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the Assessor present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the Assessor present testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the testimony of the testimon	nanufacturing property own, city, or village. For cipality is \$2,700,000 and th en the assessment level is said erties: Yes: \bigcap No: \bigcap Yes: \bigcap No: \bigcap

4. The Board of Review finds that the assessment Yes: No: No:
If Yes, list the factors that the Board of Review relies on to make its determination as to fair market value:
What was the most credible evidence presented:
D. DECISION (Motion must be made and seconded.)
1.
Brown
Moves: Exercising its judgment and discretion, pursuant to Sec. 70.47(9)(a) of Wis. Statutes, the Board of Review by majority and roll call vote hereby determines:
Christians
Seconds, (mark all that apply): That the Assessor's valuation is correct;
that the Assessor presented evidence of the fair market value of the subject property using assessment methods which conform to the statutory requirements and which are outlined in the <u>Wisconsin Property Assessment Manual</u> ;
that the Assessor presented evidence of the proper classification of the subject property using assessment methods which conform to the statutory requirements and which are outlined in the <u>Wisconsin Property Assessment Manual</u> ;
that the proper use values were applied to the agricultural land;
that the proper fractional assessments were applied to undeveloped land and agricultural forest land classifications;
that the property owner did not present sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption of correctness granted by law to the Assessor;
that the Assessor's valuation is reasonable in light of all the relevant evidence;
and sustains the same valuation as set by the Assessor;
(in certain cases), It is not relevant to present assessments of other properties as a basis for the market value of the appeal property.

2.	
Moves: Exercising its judgment and discretion, pursuant Board of Review, by majority and roll call vote hereby de	
Seconds, (mark all that apply): That the Assessor's valuation is incorrect;	
inat the Assessor's variation is incorrect,	
that the property owner has presented sufficient evidence by law to the Assessor;	e to rebut the presumption of correctness granted
that the property owner valuation is reasonable in light of	of the relevant evidence;
that the fair market value of the property is:	
Land:	•
Improvements:	
Total:	
that the level of assessment of the municipality is at	
and hereby sets the new assessment at	
Land:	
Improvements:	
Total:	
Total Johnson	
I, Teri Lehrke Clerk that the members of the Board of Review voted as follows:	of the Board of Review, do hereby certify llows:
the members of the Bourd of Review Voted us 10,	
Name of Board of Review Member: Yes No	
Nick Passe	
Dan Ryan	
Kenna Christians	
Mike Brown ☑	
Susan Dillenbeck	
to adopt these Findings of Fact, Determinations	and Decision on this 3rd day of
June , 20 19 .	and Decision on thisday or
	·
	Teri Lehrke
	Clerk of Board of Review

				•			
			,				
				•			
			·				
						•	
					•		
	. •						
							÷
	•						
•						•	
							•
			•				
		-					
	•						
	. :						
				•		•	
	•				• .		
~		•					
			,				
			•				
			-				
				1			
							•
			•		j.		
	•						

2019

CITY OF LA CROSSE BOARD OF REVIEW



Appeal by Irvin Hougom 105 7th Street S La Crosse, Wi 54601

Report Prepared by Patrick Burns – State Certified Assessor III

			Й , у
			1
		· ·	
·			
		. '	
			•
	·		

City of La Crosse, La Crosse County 2019 Market Valuation Detail

Tax key number:

017-020177-100

Property address: 105 7th St S, City of La Crosse, La Crosse County

Land Item Valued	Value Breakdown	\$ Value
Commercial land (100 front Value of land	100 FF at \$1,733 per FF	\$173,300
feet)	<u> </u>	

Total market value:

\$173,300

Building 1

Item Description	Cost Breakdown	\$ Value
ction 1 (1 story above grade area)		
	1,392 SF at \$87.28 per SF	\$121,494
	1,392 SF at \$18.74 per SF	\$26,086
	1,392 SF at \$21.47 per SF	\$29,886
117.10 0011	Replacement Cost New	\$177,466
Main structure of Section 1, Yr built=1953, Eff yr built=1980 (eff	55.0% of \$177,466	-\$97,606
	Physical Depreciation	-\$97,606
Neighborhood group	Factor = 1.000 (+0%)	
Neighborhood: Comm Bus Dist \$12.00	Factor = 1.000 (+0%)	
	Ction 1 (1 story above grade area) Commercial Building Section Occupancy 'Office building' Exterior walls component 'stud-stucco' HVAC component 'package unit' Main structure of Section 1, Yr built=1953, Eff yr built=1980 (eff age=39 as of 2019) Neighborhood group	Ction 1 (1 story above grade area) Commercial Building Section Occupancy 'Office building' Exterior walls component 'stud-stucco' HVAC component 'package unit' Main structure of Section 1, Yr built=1953, Eff yr built=1980 (eff age=39 as of 2019) Neighborhood group Neighborhood group 1,392 SF at \$87.28 per SF 1,392 SF at \$18.74 per SF Replacement Cost New 55.0% of \$177,466

Total market value of Building 1*:

\$79,900

Total above grade area:

1,392

\$ per SF:

\$57.40

75 x 80 paving, concrete

Category	Item Description	Cost Breakdown	🛚 💲 Value 🔙 🗓
Replacement	Grade: C	Factor = 1.000 (+0%)	
Cost New	Local modifier	Factor = 1.250 (+25.0%)	
	Base cost: Concrete	6,000 SF at \$6.10 per SF	\$36,600
		Replacement Cost New	\$36,600
Physical Depreciation	Main structure, Yr built=1953, Eff yr built=1983 (eff age=36 as of 2019), Condition=AV	98.5% of \$36,600	-\$36,051
Bopi Coration.		Physical Depreciation	-\$36,051

Total market value of 75 x 80 paving, concrete*:

\$500

Total SF:

6,000

\$ per SF:

\$0.08

Summanu	of Market Value
Land	\$173,300
Improvements	\$80,400
Total	\$253,700

Summary of	
Sale date	3/24/2010
Sale price	\$250,000

^{*} All market values shown are as of Jan 1, 2019. Any allocation of the total value estimated in this report between land and the improvements applies only under the stated program of utilitzation. The separate values must not be used individually and are invalid if so used.

•

DATE: May 22, 2019 COMPUTER #: 17-20177-100

LACROSSE ASSESSORS OFFICE

MARKET APPROACH

			ALLACACII		
	COMPARABLE 1	COMPARABLE 2	COMPAKABLE 3	COMPARABLE 4	COMPARABLE 5
## #	17-20177-100	17-10460-100	17-20175-80,90	17-20144-80	17-10286-100
		1825 Sunset Ln	122 7Th St S	712 LaCrosse St	2216 State Rd 16
Feb	Feb	November 28, 2018	October 11, 2018	September 27, 2018	September 25, 2017
т)	\$250,000	\$260,000	\$660,000	\$250,000	\$350,000
	1,392	2,514	3,870	3,374	2,400
LAND SIZE 7,480	7,480	28,619	16,466	5,681	35,632
PRICE/BLDG SQ FT \$179.60	\$179.60	\$103.42	\$170.54	\$74.10	\$145.83
AGE OF SALE (MONTHS)	0	0	0	0	C
TIME ADJ	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
ADJ PRICE/SF BLDG	\$179.60	\$103.42	\$170.54	\$74.10	\$145.83
YR BULLT 1953	0 1953 0	1935 0	1965	0 1900 0	1973 0
ZONING Commercial	Commercial 0	ਹ 	Commercial 0	Light Ind 0	Commercial 0
		Inferior	Inferior	Inferior	Inferior 25
N/AGE		Inferior	Similar	Inferior	<i>•</i>
		Similar	Superior -10		
0		Similar			Similar 0
		2,514	3,870	3,374	
ATIO		1:11.38	1: 4.25	1: 3.29	1: 14.85
<u> </u>		Similar		Similar	Similar
LEVATO]				Similar	Similar
# OF APT'S None	Similar	0 Similar 0	Similar 0	Storage 0	Similar 0
OIHER		DSMt -1	0		
TOTAL % ADJ TOTAL \$ ADJ	\$0.00	35% \$36.20	12% \$20.47	49% \$36.31	12%
VALUE PER/SQ FT	\$179.60	\$139.62	\$191.01	\$110.40	\$163.33
WEIGHTED VALUE 18					
RELIABILITY (1-10)	т	0	6	0	9
CONTRIBUTION % CONTRIBUTION \$	16.67% \$29.93	0.00% \$0.00	\$0.00%	\$0.00% \$0.00	33.33%
ra Os/ dad all 1474 date 4 Ordina	6170 60	TATAL TATA TATA	00% 020		The second secon
INDICALED VALUE PENSOFI	97/3.90	ASSESSOR	\$220,400 Patrick Burns		

\$191.01

\$179.60

\$163.33

\$139.62

\$110.40

NOTES: 5% for bldg size 7% for land difference 5% for 20yrs bldge age

							ð', í n
							e.
•							
							,
·			. •				
-		•					
	·	4					
·			٠			,	
	\$.	٠					
				•			
						·	•
				,			·
					v		
			•		z		
,							
			e .			•	

Plate #		Computer#	17-20017-0)10	Address:	105	7Th St S		
Year:2019		5/21/2019		Town of LaC	Crosse		Owner:	Hougom	-
Type Building 1:		2		3		4		Assessor:	Pat
Lease Area 1st:		2	0	3	0	40		Total:	1,392
	COMMERCIA			CONTRACT	•	T		MARKET	
Туре	Area	Floor	M Rent	A Rent	GR/SF		M Rent	A Rent	GR/SF
Office	1,392	1	\$0	\$0	\$0.00		- \$2,200	\$26,400	\$18.97
	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0.00		\$0	\$0	\$0.00
	0	0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0.00		\$0	\$0	\$0.00
	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0.00		\$0		\$0.00
Total	1,392		\$0	\$0	\$0.00		\$2,200	\$26,400	\$18.97
Total Gross Annu	al Income		April 1	\$0				\$26,400	
Less Vacancy Allov	vance	244	0%	\$0	· .	_	5%	\$1;320	,
Adjusted Gross A	nnual Income	•		\$0	\$0.00			\$25,080	\$18.02
Other income				\$0		1.	•	\$0	
Total Adjusted Gr	oss Annual Ir	ncome		\$0	1,8			\$25,080	
EXPENSES	¥-2		% Of Gross	Amount	Per Sq Ft	1%	Of Gross	Amount	•
ı	Management		0%	\$0	\$0.00	1	2%	\$600	\$0.43
j	Legal Fee	147 1	0%	\$0	\$0.00	-	0%	\$0	\$0.00
. /	Advertising	* **	0%	\$0	\$0.00		0%	\$0	\$0.00
.1	Nages & Salar	ies 🛸	0%		\$0.00		0%	\$0	\$0.00
	Supplies	(**	0%		\$0.00		.0%	. \$0	\$0.00
]	Decorating	. 1	0%	\$0	\$0.00	-	0%	\$0	\$0.00
(Cleaning Service	ce	0%		\$0.00		0%	\$0	\$0.00
· F	Rubbish Remo	val	0%		\$0.00		0%	\$ 0	\$0.00
	Jtilities(heat,ele	ectric,water)	0%	\$0	\$0.00		0%	⊹\$0	\$0.00
ļ	nsurance		0%	\$0	\$0.00		1%	\$300	\$0.22
. N	Visc.		0%	\$0	.\$0.00		0%	\$0	\$0.00
<u> </u>	Reserve		0%	\$0	\$0.00	<u> </u>	4%	\$1,000	\$0.72
j	Total Expenses	3	0%	\$0	\$0.00		8%	\$1,900	\$1.36
Net Operating Inc	ome(before t		100%	\$0	\$0.00		92%	\$23,180	\$16.65
1	NOI/CR	0.090	FMV=	\$0			FMV=	\$257,556	
Taxes M.R.		ear 2018	0%	\$0	\$0.00		0%	\$0	\$0.00
Total Expenses (inc	duding taxes)		0%	\$0	\$0.00		8%	\$1,900	\$1.36
Net Operating Inc		· ·		\$0_	\$0.00			\$23,180	\$16.65
Net Operating Inc	ome/ Cap Ra	te	9.0%	• \$0				\$257,556	\$185.03
DELGADO LAW	OFFICES EL C	3	727	4TH ST S			1,200	\$16.50	NNN
INDEPENDENT L				HORTON ST	r		1,200	\$22.20	
ENGELSON & AS				MORMON C			1,200	\$20.00	
FAMILY MEDICAL				STATE ST	· ; •-		1,200	\$23.88	
PROMETRIC INC				7TH ST S			1,688	\$14.96	
	•						1298	\$19.51	

Low High \$14.96 \$16.50 \$20.00 \$22.20 \$23.88

	· ·			
STUBER LAW OFFICE	420 5TH AVE S	c	625	\$23.04 NNN
MAC GUYS THE	40 COPELANI	110	1,095	\$12.65 NNN
CREATIVE COIV residential c	1940 STATE RD		1,108	\$14.30 NNN
LPL FINANCIAL	121 4TH ST N		1,200	\$14.00 NNN
DELGADO LAW OFFICES LI	727 4TH ST S	andre Santana (1995). Andre Santana (1995).	1,200	\$15.00 NNN
INDEPENDENT LIVING CHC	1533 HORTON ST	the Paris	1,200	\$18.50 NNN
ENGELSON & ASSOCIATES	3317 MORMON COL	JLEE RD	1,200	\$20.00 NNN
FAMILY MEDICAL SUPPLY (705 STATE ST		1,200	\$23.88 NNN
CONSTRUCTION EXPRESS	411 LA CROSSE S	T	1,256	\$14.33 NNN
FARMERS INSURANCE (IR\	105 7TH ST S	4	1,400	\$10.41 NNN
KING STREET TAX & BOOK	149 6TH ST S	2.	1,600	\$12.98 NNN
PROMETRIC INC	210 7TH ST S	4) 🐃	1,688	\$14.81 NNN
RELIANT REAL ESTATE SEI	720 CASS ST		1,800	- \$20.00 NNN
VISION THERAPY ACADEM	3424 MORMON (В	2,000	\$18.00 NNN
BRANDAU & WALTZ LAW C	420 5TH AVE S	B %	2,059	\$20.44 NNN
TOSTRUD & TEMP	609 4TH ST S	B	2,240	\$18.75 NNN
N 1.35	 Control of the second of the se	1 2 A 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4		

SEÇLET

CHARLEST STATE

Application of the control of the cont

PRINCIPAL BUILDING TOLD

er til skalt læggigg gjallig fil ek af

alt mark in klassissakus attal Lipi in klassissa markatikatik

graph resemble a contract of the graph of the selection

Maria Maria

Objection to Real Property Assessment

To file an appeal on your property assessment, you must provide the Board of Review (BOR) clerk written or oral notice of your intent, under state law (sec. 70.47(7)(a), Wis. Stats.). You must also complete this entire form and submit it to your municipal clerk. To review the best evidence of property value, see the Wisconsin Department Revenue's Property Assessment Appeal Guide for Wisconsin Real Property Owners.

Complete all sections:		unioni di Salua dei Arrisa II	DONOR EDWINSON	and the state of t			
Section 1: Property Owner / A		mation	* If agent,	submit written authorization (P	am PA-105) with this form		
Property owner name (on changed assessment IRVIN L. HOUGOM	it notiče)		Agent name (If applicable RECEIVED				
Owner mailing address			Agent mailing address				
105 7th St. S			MAY 1 7 2019				
LACROSSE	State WI	^{Zip} 54601	City	LA CROSSE			
Owner phone (608) 784 - 9004 ih	all ougom1@	aol com	Owner phone	CITY AS SESSO)H		
Section 2: Assessment inform		the second of th					
Property address			Legal descrip	tion or parcel no. (on changed assessm	ent notice)		
105 7TH ST. S			4				
LA CROSSE	State WI	^{Zlp} 54601					
Assessment shown on notice - Total \$ 253,700 Your opinion of assessed value - Total \$ 230,000							
V 2001; 000							
If this property contains non-market value class acreage, provide your opinion of the taxable value breakdown: Statutory Class Acres \$ Per Acre Full							
Statutory Class Residential total market value		Acres	43,470,347,460,240				
Commercial total market value					230,000		
Agricultural classification: # of tillak	de acres		ø	S acre use value	<u> </u>		
# of past			<u> </u>	S acre use value			
A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR	lalty acres		@	\$ acre use value			
Undeveloped classification # of acres			@	\$ acre @ 50% of market value			
Agricultural forest classification # of a	on programming or special control of the control of		@	\$ acre @ 50% of market value			
Forest classification # of acres			@	\$ acre @ market value	,		
Class 7 "Other" total market value	www.ingrappoordon.			market value			
Managed forest land acres			@	\$ acre @ 50% of market value			
Managed forest land acres			@	\$ acre @ market value			
Section 3: Reason for Objecti	on and Bas	is of Estimate	Annual Annual Property of the Control of the Contro		And the state of t		
Reason(s) for your objection: (Aftach ad Average cost per sq. ft for downto \$20 per sq. ft.	dditional sheel Wn La Cros	s if needed) se per Pat Burns is	Basis for you \$23,13 us \$20 avera	ar opinion of assessed value: (Attac ed on new assessment is over ge has no negative credit for th	h additional sheets if needed) average for downtown. ne buried fuel tanks.		
Section 4: Other Property Inf	ormation	The commence of the commence o	A TEXT TO SERVICE AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY O	Control of the Contro	The second secon		
A. Within the last 10 years, did you	acquire the	property?		************	Yes 🔀 No		
If Yes, provide acquisition price		Date -		Purchase Trade	☐ Gift ☐ Inheritance		
B. Within the last 10 years, did you		- G	nm-dd-yyyy)	-	Yes No		
•	change ms	property (ex. remode	y,accustory;		Kanadi and K		
If Yes, describe Date of Cost of changes changes	of ges \$	Does this a	ost include th	e value of all labor (including your	own)? Yes No		
 Within the last five years, was th 	Is property I	isted/offered for sale:	? ;	Galanda aya aya aya aya aya aya aya aya aya a	Yes 🛛 No		
If Yes, how long was the propert Asking price \$	y listed (prov	ride dates)	to _	(mm-dd-yyyy)			
D. Within the last five years, was th	is property:	appraised?	ala ala e e e e e e e e e) - N - + + 2 - + 5 + + 6 + 12 + 12 + 12 + 12 + 12 + 12 + 1	Yes X No		
If Yes, provide: Date	- '	/alue	Purpose	of appraisal			
If this property had more than or	ne appraisai,	provide the requeste	d intormation	r for each appraisar.			
Section 5: BOR Hearing Infor	mation	The production of interesting a group that defend to	The second secon	Philosophia and the second of	The state of the s		
A. If you are requesting that a BOR Note: This does not apply in first o	member(s) r second class	be removed from you cities.	ır hearing, pr	ovide the name(s):			
B. Provide a reasonable estimate of	f the amour	nt of time you need at	the hearing	30 minutes.			
Property owner or Agent signature		many (de 16 de			Date (mm-tld-yyyy) 05 - 17 - 2019		

PA-115A (R. 10-18)

Wisconsin Department of Revenue

			
	•		4.4
•			
	•		
			•
			-
			•
		·	
			•
•			
•			
	·		
		•	