

# 2905

Recvd. 9-8-15 delivered to

D. Hughes  
JK

**PETITION FOR REVIEW OF REAL PROPERTY VALUATION**

PURSUANT TO A.R.S. TITLE 42, Ch. 16, Art. 3 and Ch. 16, Art. 1-5

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FILED FOR TAX YEAR 2016

See Instructions for complete filing information 7333A

APR 22 2015

- In all counties, mail or hand deliver one copy of this completed petition to the County Assessor. Retain a copy for your records (and for use in possible further appeals). Taxpayers receiving a Notice of Value have sixty days from the date the notice was mailed to file this petition. United States Postal Service postmark dates are evidence of the dates petitions were filed and decisions were mailed.
- The County Assessor may reject any petition not meeting statutory requirements. Only one petition for each parcel or economic unit will be accepted. Any duplicate petition(s) will be returned.

COMPLETE SECTIONS 1 THROUGH 10 WHERE APPLICABLE. TYPE OR PRINT

1. DATE FILED 03/31/2015 COUNTY Gila BOOK 304 MAP 07 PARCEL 021B

2. PROPERTY ADDRESS OR LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 706 E Hwy 260

3. IF THIS IS A MULTIPLE PARCEL APPEAL CHECK HERE  ATTACH A MULTIPLE PARCEL APPEAL FORM (DOR 82131). SEE INSTRUCTIONS.

4. USE OF PROPERTY: COMMERCIAL / INDUSTRIAL  (SPECIFY TYPE: Apartment, Office, warehouse, etc.)  
 VACANT LAND  AGRICULTURAL  OTHER

5A. OWNER'S NAME  
TEAM CB PETROLEUM PROPERTIES LLC  
 NAME  
1773 E Prince Road  
 ADDRESS  
Tucson AZ 85719-1926  
 CITY, STATE, ZIP CODE

5B. MAIL DECISION TO: (IF DIFFERENT THAN 5A)  
310 Paradigm Tax Group  
 NAME  
1773 E Prince Road  
 ADDRESS  
Tucson AZ 85719-1926  
 CITY, STATE, ZIP CODE

5C. IF OWNERSHIP HAS CHANGED CHECK HERE  ATTACH RECORDED DOCUMENTATION.

6. PETITION COMPLETED BY: (Specify Owner, Agent, Attorney, etc.) Agent  
Paradigm Tax Group  
 NAME  
1773 E Prince Road Tucson AZ 85719-1926  
 ADDRESS CITY, STATE, ZIP CODE  
520 885-4617  
 TELEPHONE

AGENTS ONLY: STATE BOARD OF APPRAISAL NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_ STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION NUMBER 310

7. BASIS FOR PETITION: MARKET SALES APPROACH  COST APPROACH  INCOME APPROACH  OTHER  (explain below)  
 Additional documents submitted must contain the book, map, and parcel number and be attached to the petition in order to be considered by the Assessor. Evidence contained in this appeal could be the basis for either increasing or decreasing the valuation or changing the legal classification of the property. Subject sale 10/2/14 \$300,000.

\*\* See Attached Schedule A \*\*

8. VALUE SHOWN ON NOTICE OF VALUE	FULL CASH VALUE \$ <u>524,826</u>	LIMITED PROPERTY VALUE \$ <u>524,826</u>	LEGAL CLASS <u>1</u>	ASMT RATIO <u>18</u>
9. OWNER'S OPINION OF VALUE	FULL CASH VALUE \$ <u>300,000</u>	LIMITED PROPERTY VALUE \$	LEGAL CLASS <u>1</u>	ASMT RATIO <u>18</u>

10. I HEREBY AFFIRM THAT THE INFORMATION INCLUDED OR ATTACHED IS TRUE AND CORRECT.  
 X [Signature]  
 SIGNATURE OF PROPERTY OWNER OR REPRESENTATIVE  
520 885-4617  
 TELEPHONE EMAIL

TO REQUEST A MEETING WITH THE ASSESSOR CHECK HERE   
 FOR SBOE (IN MARICOPA AND PIMA COUNTIES ONLY):  
 If you want this appeal to be heard "On The Record" check here.   
 This means that neither you, the Assessor, your Agent, or Attorney (if applicable) will appear before the State Board of Equalization to offer testimony. Submit any additional written or typed information with this appeal to the SBOE.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

ASSESSOR'S DECISION	FULL CASH VALUE \$ <u>524,826</u>	LIMITED PROPERTY VALUE \$ <u>524,826</u>	LEGAL CLASS <u>0112</u>	ASMT RATIO <u>18%</u>
BASIS FOR DECISION: <u>See attached</u>				
<u>4/22/15</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	DATE RECEIVED DATE DECISION MAILED REVIEWED BY ASSESSOR OR CHIEF DEPUTY	
COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION DECISION	FULL CASH VALUE \$	LIMITED PROPERTY VALUE \$	LEGAL CLASS	ASMT RATIO
BASIS FOR DECISION:				
DATE RECEIVED	DATE DECISION MAILED	CHAIRMAN OR CLERK OF THE BOARD		

# Assessor's Decision to the Petition for Review of Real Property Valuation for 2016 Tax Year Parcel Number: 304-07-021B

Due to the lack of additional comparable sales to compare to the Subject, and in the absence of income information provided by the Petitioner, a cost comparable analysis was performed on the Subject Property. Improvements were chosen with the same Built As description and Quality, and with similar years of construction.

Parcel #	Built As Description	Quality	Year Built	Imp Value	Built As SF	Imp Value per SF
30256002F	Mini-Mart Convenience Stores	Average	2000	\$444,930.57	4714	\$94.38
30402012B	Mini-Mart Convenience Stores	Average	1998	\$257,903.19	3360	\$76.76
30240002N	Mini-Mart Convenience Stores	Average	2005	\$316,524.00	3212	\$98.54
30235251B	Mini-Mart Convenience Stores	Average	2008	\$359,284.41	3185	<b>\$112.81</b>
30242023D	Mini-Mart Convenience Stores	Average	1996	\$225,571.23	3336	\$67.62
30416128A	Mini-Mart Convenience Stores	Average	1990	\$237,387.51	3720	<b>\$63.81</b>
30407021B	Mini-Mart Convenience Stores	Average	1998	\$251,424.00	2694	<b>\$93.33</b>

The comparables range in value from \$63.81 to \$112.81 per square foot. The Subject Improvement is valued within the acceptable range, at \$93.33 per square foot.

The comparables support the Subject Property's 2016 Full Cash Value of \$524,826.

*OK*  
*8-4-15*

02/11/16

**SCHEDULE A**

**PARADIGM TAX GROUP**

**SUPPLEMENT TO  
PETITION FOR REVIEW OF REAL PROPERTY VALUATION  
(DOR Form 82130)**

**7. BASIS FOR THIS PETITION**

The subject property may be overvalued in comparison to similar properties. In addition, the subject property has been overvalued due to: (1) the failure to consider value on a "cash" rather than a "terms" basis and make the appropriate adjustment, (2) the inability to obtain lender financing on land and other types of property, (3) the failure to discount for future increments of value.

In addition, Petitioner reserves the right to any raise issues affecting valuation and classification once they become known, including but not limited to the following: developability, marketability, topography, classification, current use, zoning, access, potential flooding, frontage to depth ratio, environmental hazards, deed restrictions and other legal/environmental restrictions.

The Petitioner may also raise the issue of the accuracy of the Assessor's records as to all matters, including, but not limited to the following: site size, size of improvements, cost model, classification, current use (including, but not limited to agricultural, grazing, nonprofit or exempt), full cash value, limited value and assessment ratio.

Pursuant to ARS 42-16002(B) In the year subsequent to an appeal, the valuation or classification of property is the valuation or classification that was determined in the preceding year at the highest level of appeal unless there is new construction, a structural change or a change of use on the property.