Order of the	Kittitas	County

## **Board of Equalization**

Property Owner:	Shree Lakshmi Ganesha LLC								
Parcel Number(s):_4	468633								
Assessment Year:	2022	Petition Number: BE-220193							
Date(s) of Hearing:	_10/20/2022_								
sustains	overrules 🛚		ties in this appeal, the Board tion of the assessor.	l hereby:					
Assessor's True and	d Fair Value		<b>BOE True and Fair Va</b>	lue Dete	<u>rmination</u>				
∠ Land	\$	757,400	∠ Land	\$	757,400				
	\$	6,453,470		\$	3,136,075				
Minerals	\$		Minerals	\$					
Personal Prope	erty \$		Personal Property	\$					
Total Value	\$	7,210,870	Total Value	\$	3,893,475				

## This decision is based on our finding that:

The issue before the Board is the assessed value of land/improvements.

A hearing was held on October 20, 2022. Those present: Ann Shaw, Jennifer Hoyt, Josh Cox, Clerk Emily Smith, Appraiser Dana Glen, and Appellant Representative Mayur Deesai and observer Debbie Stanavich.

The appellant stated the subject is a Sure Stay hotel, it is a mid-scale class hotel. The income approach is straight forward, 71.4% expenses based on industry expenses, with 4% in replacement reserves, and the unloaded cap rate at 9%, that brings the adjusted market value to \$4,000,000. The issue with this case is the income the assessor had is incorrect, the actuals are 1,500,000, and the assessor has it as \$3,425,000.

Mr. Glen stated that is a Sure Stay hotel assessed at \$7,210,870. Exhibit 1 shows it is 102 units, it is a mid-scale hotel. He went over his exhibit 4, the sales analysis. Since the assessor's office doesn't have access to the books of these hotels, they are assessed on information that is available, which is sales, number of units, and sale price per unit. The subject is assessed at \$70,695 per unit. The available is about \$70,000 per unit. Looking at room reservation rates, the subject is average \$92 per night per room. Mr. Glen explained the process he uses for comparing hotels. The appellant reported a rate of \$68 per unit per night. When you do capitalization, you don't include property tax an expense, the mortgage expense is also in the cap rate. The appellant miscalculated the cap rate. There are inconsistencies with what is available and what was presented by the appellant.

The appellant stated that the 2 comparable properties that the appaired submitted were sold after the evaluation date, so it shouldn't be used. As for the cap rate, he argued why he kept certain factors in, and even if you used the logic the appraiser used with the values given, they are still being over valued by \$2,000,000. It is an income producing property, so they used the income approach.

The appraiser stated that you can use sales after the date if you trend them back. They did not change hotel values during the pandemic.

The board has determined that the assessed value of the improvements should be reduced to \$3,136,075 and the land is sustained at \$757,400 for a total assessed value of \$3,893,475. The board applied the actual revenue to the income multiplier provided by the assessor's office to determine value.

Dated this	day of	December	, (year)	2022	
	Ann 8	Snau	9	misson	

Chairperson's Signature

Clerk's Signature

## NOTICE

This order can be appealed to the State Board of Tax Appeals by filing a formal or informal appeal with them at PO Box 40915, Olympia, WA 98504-0915 or at their website at bta.state.wa.us/appeal/forms.htm within thirty days of the date of mailing of this order. The appeal forms are available from either your county assessor or the State Board of Tax Appeals.

To ask about the availability of this publication in an alternate format for the visually impaired, please call 1-800-647-7706. Teletype (TTY) users use the Washington Relay Service by calling 711.

Distribution: • Assessor • Petitioner • BOE File

REV 64 0058 (5/25/2017)