State of Vermont Chartered in 1781

MORRISTOWN

# BOARD OF LISTERS MEETING MINUTES
# OF JUNE 24, 2026

Members: Grant Wieler, Kevin Petrochko (Listers), Terri Sabens (Assessor)

Absent: Vacant seat

Staff:

Guests: Selina Rooney, Chip Percy, Matthew Percy, Hanna Farda, Joseph Streeter, Fred Woeckener, & Bruce Loren

**CALL TO ORDER**

Board of Listers Chairperson, Grant Wieler, called the meeting to order at 9:58 AM.

**NEW BUSINESS**

1. **Grievance Hearings**
   **a. Rooney**
   **b. Dale E Percy, Inc.**
   **c. Farda**
   **d. Comcast Corp.**
   **e. Streeter**
   **f. Woeckener**
   **g. Loren**
   ~~~~~~~~

   **a. Rooney**

   After the Chairperson's introduction, Selina Rooney began the Grievance Hearings by stating that the basis for her grievance is that 2693 Mud City Loop is a 2BR (not 3BR) and that the location is bad because headlights shine right into the house from the busy intersection nearby. The house is also 200 meters from the manure pit of the Farm.

   She shared several sales from the area having a sales history of 0-3 years prior and cited their sales prices or ‘appraisal’ values (clarified to mean assessments, upon inquiry by TS). A Babcock road sale for $335k was listed, but not later found within the MLS. A Patch road sale was named and later found to be 299 Patch, selling for $325k. A house that the Rooney’s sold in 2025, at 3689 Mud City Loop was named, but not found within the MLS, later, among others.

   During follow up questions, KP noted that the house is not upon its own lot and in regards to the manure smells diminishing the value, any owner of this house would likely be a farmer that would not object to the smells and sounds of a farm; that they would control those as environmental variables. To the complaint of the intersection and lights, he noted that the house is in close proximity to Beaver Meadows, which is a popular recreational area, so there were ‘plusses’ that may offset the negatives she notes about the site.
   ~~~~~~~~

Selina's argument for lower value also included mention of 2 farm buildings that were noted as Homestead/Housesite in the lister record (their value not being exempted in the Current Use plan currently). Selina noted that of the 14 buildings they have at the farm, her conversations with the Current Use contact person clarified that 4 of them were of a temporary nature and that of the 10 buildings listed with the town, all of those are enrolled and should be exempted.

Going back to the house structure, the Listers discussed the newer age of the garage and the history of the house, being that it was a rebuild in 1950 upon a much older foundation. Selina went on to clarify that a remodel of the kitchen was done in 1981 when her grandmother had passed away.

Selina went on to emphasize that the house *if standing alone* would not show well compared to the comps she provided and that she felt the value should not be over $400. (*The house itself is not upon a separate lot and is part of the larger lands with farm and buildings associated).

Having no other comments or questions from either side, the Rooney hearing was concluded.

**b. Dale E Percy, Inc.**

Chip and Matt Percy were in attendance to grieve the value of the 7.15 acre 'retained lands' associated with their development on Elizabeth Lane. They testified that the 'retained lands' should be treated the same as common lands (to have no assessed value) and that they were only made separate to accommodate Morristown's Zoning requirements for Conservation Subdivisions (which stipulate that roads and infrastructure not be part of common land areas when used to calculate the offset of buildable lots). They also objected to a pond value of $5,000 which they are required to have for fire suppression, and remarked that the solar field has statutes applicable to not being valued based on the solar income.

Chip related that they built out the development in 3 phases to circumvent Act 250 permitting requirements and that it's 'all done' now. He testified that he gives the small solar rents to the Association ($1,200/year) and that the retained lands with all improvements were just about to convey to the Association; that they (Percy) were 'out of there'.

KP asked if the solar field and lease would also convey when or if they planned to retain the lease, to which Chip confirmed it was all part of that being conveyed.

Additional discussion of statute followed along with pond value and general discussion around conservation subdivisions. TS advised that common land is normally valued at zero after being conveyed to HOAs. Chip and Matt pointed out that they believe every such subdivision will now require Open (common) and Retained lands. With no further comments to add or questions from either side, the Percy hearing was completed.

**c. Farda**

Hanna wanted to question the value of her property as she was told by a former town official (T Thomas) that a neighbor of hers was taxed far less for a larger property. She stated that 114 Cote Hill Road is similar, but much larger in acreage, although she wasn't sure if they were in Current Use or not. She noted different BR/BA counts, but wasn't sure how much that weighed in to final value.

KP noted that the neighbor's property did not show in the map he included in the packet and started to explain how quality, condition, and area were more relevant than BR/BA counts and then asked about renovations that HF may have completed. She listed minor maintenance items, but nothing that would qualify at a remodel or renovation.

With no further testimony and no follow up questions to add, the Farda hearing was completed.

**d. Comcast Corp.**

As the applicant was not in attendance, the letter requesting grievance was noted along with mention of instructions from the State to Listers to deny all grievances from Telecom (TC) properties. This allows them to be escalated automatically to BCA upon appeal of Lister denial, or directly to PVR or Superior Court (if a stipulation agreement is entered into).

GW made a motion to Pause for deliberation until the next hearing at 11:00. KP seconds motion.

GW re-opens the hearings and introduces Joseph Streeter.

**e. Streeter**

After introductions, Joseph Streeter opened the hearing by saying that he wanted to see if he could save some money on taxes. He states that his principal reason was because he is on a class 4 unmaintained road and has to work on it a lot to keep it passable. He also stated that his lot is less than the 2 acre minimum, having obtained a variance many years ago. He added that the shed he built was overvalued as it's just a shell with no power or running water.

TS asked if Mr Streeter qualified for a State tax credit. He confirmed that he does and TS advised that any reduction to his Home site would lower his credit from the State.

Mr Streeter relates that he is on Social security so his income doesn’t go up.

TS checked bedroom and bathroom counts with him and asked about his heat source, which was stated to be wood and a space heater. He also confirmed that his basement was poured concrete.

KP opened the topic of the shed and relates his discovery of it, as an un-permitted structure discovered while doing nearby permit inspections. Mr Streeter relates that it is an AG building and should be zoning AND tax exempt. He was told by TS that tax exemption only applies when the land is enrolled in current use (which it is not). KP goes on to relate that he needed a letter from the State and to supply it in advance to the ZA to get the exemption, which triggers communication to the Listers. KP then goes on to describe how the cost approach was used to arrive at his $11,100 value.

GW questions if the lean-to portion of the building was included in the 30x30’ measurement, to which Mr. Streeter clarifies that the main building is 30x20 and the lean-to portion is 10x28. KP acknowledges that he should revisit the two and separate them to be re-run within CAMA.

TS asks if it’s truly a sugar house or just a shed. Joseph answers that it IS a sugar house and is for hobby use and to supply his family and friends.

GW made a motion to Pause for deliberation at 11:13 am, until the next hearing at 1:00 PM. KP seconds the motion.

GW re-opens the hearings at 12:58 PM and introduces Fred Woeckener.

**f. Woeckener**

Mr Woeckener opens by saying that he and his neighbor made an equal land swap but that he gave the neighbor land along the frontage, so he feels that he gave the neighbor a more valuable piece of land and that he should get a value reduction because of doing so. He was trading more valuable land for less valuable land, in his opinion, because of the frontage aspect, a better lot shape and now he (the neighbor) doesn't have to use a ROW for access as he owns his driveway now.

He goes on to state that supplying comps wasn't possible because it's a unique situation.

GW asks if the conveyed land (0.186 acres) was just to make the driveway of his neighbor 'owned' or other reasons. FW confirms that as the primary reason.

KP began by stating that frontage is a factor in land grade but a small one. He noted that frontage, in cases involving lake frontage, had much more of a bearing on value. He remarked that the 2023 reappraisal appeared to give little weight to the frontage in this neighborhood and also confirmed his awareness of the swap and that no value change had been made at the time as the net land area was the same, before and after.

KP asked if Mr Woeckener felt his land was lesser, similar, or better than lots around him, to which Mr Woeckener stated that he had a large ledge behind him which made his lot wetter then some of his neighbors and that he had suffered a small pond washing out recently (since repaired by Andy Naylor).

At this time, KP introduced a neighborhood map showing all the adjoining neighbors, with land grades of 1.50-2.00 versus Mr Woeckeners grade of 1.00. Also attached to these documents (a copy of which was given to Mr W) are the data card excerpts from the neighbors showing much higher land values around him along with a range of frontage lengths shown on the map.

Mr W expressed again that he felt frontage is usually more valuable.

KP mentioned to Mr W that GW was a real estate agent and posed the question to him of 'if a 2.4 acre lot in this zone (which requires a minimum lot size of 80,000 ft/2) would have a market value appreciably higher with more frontage vrs less'. GW replied that he felt a potential house siting in relation to neighbors or other driveways carried more weight in the analysis than frontage itself.

KP goes on to wonder aloud why the difference in land grades between Mr W's 1.00 and his neighbors, which may indicate a higher value for Mr W's lot, ultimately; then relating that maybe it was the wet qualities of it.

Mr W went on to state that his neighbor's value is now higher because of the frontage and that he wouldn't have sold it for any less than $25,000 (although he chose to swap for no cost). KP replies that the land only had any utility to that neighbor and nobody else, since it had to be conveyed by BLA, and not able to be subdivided and sold on an open market.

Having no further questions or comments, FW thanked the Listers for hearing his case and the hearing was closed.

**g. Loren**

Bruce Loren opened by stating he felt there had been some 'errors in the process' of valuing his new home. He said that the last house was demoed and that his taxes didn't go down while that was the case. GW asked the reason for the demo and BL clarified that it was a purposeful demo to allow for reconstruction. He said that when the house was only 50% built, the listers had made the assessment based on a million dollar house and he couldn't understand why he was suddenly at over 1.2 million after completion.

TS inserted that the last years completion was 73%. Bruce disagreed that it was truly that level of finish in the prior year, but moved along to this year's completed value to over $1.26m.

TS said that she didn't see how BL thought it was based on a million dollars for the house. BL noted that the prior years' value as over a million at that 73% and KP interjected that $322,000 of that was land value.

BL stated that he was in error and that he had assumed we were angling for a million dollar value. It appeared that land value wasn't being accounted for in his earlier reasoning.

KP went on to explain cost tables, Marshall and Swift, and how the Listers arrive at value using a cost approach in addition to the land and site improvements.

BL again stated that it was his error and he hopes we will leave the taxes where they are.

He asked if we assess every year, to which TS answered that we are only rechecking upon new additions or permits taken. Having no other questions or comments, the Loren hearing was closed.

**ADJOURN**

Grant makes a motion to adjourn the Grievance Hearings and go into the final Deliberative session. Kevin seconds the motion. The meeting is adjourned at 1:25 PM.

*Please note all minutes are in Draft form and are subject to approval at the next Board of Listers meeting.*