MINUTES

TOWN OF BROOKLINE, VT
BOARD OF CIVIL AUTHORITY MEETING AND
PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENT APPEAL HEARING
August 20, 2026, 6:00 PM
Appellant: Andrea & Michael Seaton, 793 Grassy Brook Road

Present:

Board of Civil Authority:
Emily Beer (EB) (Vice Chair)
Marjorie Ray (MR) Town Clerk
Doug Wellman (DW)
Bruce Mello (BM)
Mark Bills (MB)

Listers:
Helen Holt (HH)

Appellant:
Andrea Seaton (AS)
Michael Seaton (MS)

Public:
None

Meeting called to order
Emily Beer calls the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. Attendees noted above.

Oaths & Rules of Procedure:
MR administers the Oath of Office to BCA Members. EB moves to adopt Rules of Procedure, seconded by BM. The motion passed unanimously and Rules of Procedure are adopted with no changes.

EB moves to approve minutes from July 30, 2026. MR seconds. The motion passed with 4 voting in favor (EB, MR, DW, MB), BM abstains.

Property Tax Assessment Appeal:
EB opens the hearing of Andrea & Michael Seaton, 793 Grassy Brook Road.
MR administers the swearing in of the Listers and Appellants.

EB asks BCA members to disclose any conflict of interest and/or ex parte communications. There are none.

Listers introduced property on appeal and presented valuation:
Property Owners are Andrea & Michael Seaton, 793 Grassy Brook Road, 10.00 acres, Span #099-031-10132.
HH describes the property and presents Lister 1, which is a 3 page document (page 1 is a screenshot from Zillow with the square footage and price per square foot corrected by hand, page 2 is the residential property record card for the subject property, and page 3 is itemized property costs record for the subject property). The property is valued by the Listers at $684,000.
Appellant presented their valuation and supporting evidence:
Appellants AS & MS submitted Appellants exhibits A and B (Appellants A and B) and requested

that the grand list value be lowered to $525,000 per the appraisal of the property when purchased. Appellants testified that they bought their home in October after it had been on the market for approximately 1 year with no other offers. The sales price was $520,000. At that time, they needed a mortgage to cover the period before their prior home was sold. The mortgage lender did an appraisal and found a value of $525,000 (see Appellants A).

The Appellants testified that they found several comparable properties with recent sales for their grievance with the listers, and then found additional comparables for this hearing (see Appellants A and B). They stated they did not find any properties they considered comparable that sold in the $700,000 market.

Appellants A is a 24 page document that contains Appellants' email requesting appeal of the listers' decision, and their application for grievance with attachments (including their mortgage application appraisal stating a value of $525,000 and Zillow printouts 9 different properties).

Appellants B is a one page document titled "Comparable Properties" that contains a chart listing the subject property and 10 other properties with a variety of data for each property, including price per square foot. Appellants testified that while there were some differences between the properties, they considered these to be comparable with the subject property. They testified that analyzing the price per square foot of these properties shows that the subject property's sale price of $520,000 is within range of these recent sales. They argued that their property's recent sale price is evidence of the fair market value of the subject property, and noted that it lines up very closely with the mortgage lender's appraised value.

EB asked HH to respond to information presented by the Appellants.
HH testified that she reviewed the lister cards for the comparable properties and the Zillow listed square footage. She found that Zillow stated square footage was broadly incorrect. She presented Listers 2, which is a 28 page document that contains a spreadsheet listing comparing the 10 properties from Appellant B with corrected acreage and price per square foot, and includes realtor website printouts and lister cards/property records for the comparable properties. HH testified that upon her review, Appellants' comparables were not as similar as it seemed. HH testified that Appellants' claimed value results in it being on the low end of the price per square foot ($215 per sf) range of the comparables, but is in the mid range when using the Listers' value for the price per square foot calculation (roughly $282 per sf).

Discussion ensued and questions by members of the BCA were answered by both HH and the Appellants. Appellants testified that the property was originally listed for sale at around $675,000, the seller reduced it to $645,000, Appellants initially offered $500,000, and the offer was accepted at $520,000. They testified that the seller overpaid in the Covid years and that she was highly motivated to sell.

HH presented the Listers' valuation and supporting evidence.
HH presented Listers 3, which is a 17 page document containing a spreadsheet listing six comparable properties, and includes realtor website printouts and lister cards/property records for the six comparable properties. HH testified that she considers these six properties to be

closer comparables for the subject property. HH testified that this information shows that, while the sale price for the subject property was lower than the lister's value, the lister's value is actually a better representation of the subject property's true market value.

HH testified that while she provided price per square foot analysis for each of the comparables, she does not consider this a property way to evaluate market value. She testified that the lister's valuation is calculated by recording all the features of the property.

EB asked Appellants to respond to information presented by HH.
Appellants asked questions of HH and discussion ensued. Appellant MS suggested that perhaps knocking out the high and low comparable values of both the Lister and Appellants' comparables would probably yield a value somewhere between Appellant's claimed value and Lister's claimed value.

Discussion ensued and questions by members of the BCA were answered by both HH and the Appellants.

A property inspection is scheduled for BCA Members, August 27th, 2026 at 4:30 PM. HH asks if she may attend and Appellants approve.

The hearing recesses until September 10th, 2026 at 6:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Marjorie Ray, Town Clerk

Supporting Documents:

Appellant A - Email with appeal of lister's decision, Application for Grievance with Attachments
Appellant B - Comps spreadsheet

Lister 1 - Zillow website listing page and lister Residential Property Record Cardand Itemized Property Costs
Lister 2 - Spreadsheet analyzing Appellant's Comps with supporting documents
Lister 3 - Listers' Comps with supporting documents