

Town of Norwich Board of Civil Authority

Tax Assessment Appeals

Tuesday, September 23, 2025

5:30pm

Kristine Williamson and Kirk Williams

Appellant Evidence Packet

Contents:

1. Appeal Letter
2. Supplementary Information
3. Twelve additional photos of property

Town of Norwich BCA Appeal of Listers' 2025 Change in Assessment of Real Estate for Land , Dwelling, and Yard Items for:

Parcel ID: 09-035.300

Address: 1415 Beaver Meadow Road, Norwich VT

Property Owners: Kristine D. Williamson and Kirk L. Williams

Daytime Telephone #: 802-649-0204 (landline, no cell service at property)

Email: haganw@live.com



Appeal Basis The assessment is incorrect as to current market value due to inadequate consideration of the property condition and land qualities, systematic errors in the assessment's approach; inaccurate comparison to and inconsistent treatment of similar properties, including an upward adjustment for our land and further upward adjustment for the neighborhood, lack of adequate acknowledgement for depreciation, and inappropriate assessment of depreciation considering primarily age; and showing arbitrary treatment, resulting in an incorrect valuation, making it both inequitable, unfair, and inconsistent with prior BCA findings. Our property was overvalued during Norwich's last Reappraisal in 2016 and we grieved and prevailed. Upon inspection town officials and the then contracted appraiser noted and found as fact that our home was *"builder grade or below"* and commented on the age of the roof and other systems, and the topography, driveway, and water issues. The assessment was lowered to our 2016 purchase price, deemed to be the fair market value. Now our home has been overvalued once again ignoring prior corrected errors in valuation and putting the burden on us once again.

History On July 22, 2016, we purchased 1415 Beaver Meadow Road in Norwich, Vermont. A 2240 square foot home with 3 bedroom 2.25 bath home on an extremely steep 6.3 acre lot in West Norwich, VT. The sale price of the home was \$355,000 and included various personal items such as two snow blowers, ladders, and other equipment. This was an arm's length transaction with sellers and buyers having no knowledge of one another or any other affiliation. The sale was conducted using realtors with Cheryl Herrmann representing us, the buyers and Leah MacLaughery representing the Grants, the sellers. The sellers acted in their own best interest. For example, they refused to fix the numerous issues outlined in the property inspection report. The sellers also charged us two days' rent to drop off some hanging and potted plants in the backyard prior to the sale. Prior to closing, home inspector, Rich Burns, owner of Shakes to Shingles in Concord, NH, did an inspection of the property and stressed the need for substantial work/cost on the driveway, along with noting other significant issues such as foundation cracking and water damage, and that every major system in the home was well beyond their life expectancies including: the roof, heater, hot water tank and well pump. At the time of purchase, 1415 Beaver Meadow Road was the least expensive house for sale in Norwich.

During the 2016 Reappraisal, the town of Norwich appraised the property at \$423,900. In June of 2017, we contested the appraised valuation of the property and the appraisal was lowered to the fair market value of \$355,000 as evidenced by the recent arm's length transaction and taking into consideration the quality and condition of the property. The property continued to be appraised for \$355,000 until June of this year, 2025, when Norwich conducted a town-wide reappraisal through KRT Appraisal. We were apprised that our property was now appraised at \$822,700, 132% increase, many times the increase of our neighbors and other townspeople. With the exception of an exterior coat of paint there were no changes or updates to our property from the time of the onsite inspection in 2017; the roof, heating system, well, and septic system are as originally installed.

On June 16, 2025, we had Informal Hearing with a representative KRT Appraisal. The next day, a different KRT representative came to our home to conduct an inspection. Notably, it started to rain while he was at the property and he commented when he was leaving about the steep incline and water pooling at the back entrance, the only way in and out of the home. Our property was reduced from the 132% increase of \$822,700 to a now appraised value of \$742,900, still a 109% increase in our assessed value. We grieved this value, had a Hearing with the Listers and KRT presenting further evidence regarding the unfairness and inequity of our appraisal. We received a letter dated August 15, 2025 informing us that our property was reduced to \$658,000, still a 86% increase that is still drastically out of line with both our homes comparables and our neighbors. Also note that they reduced the value of the house from \$519,200 to \$434,300 and did not reduce the land or yard items.

Fair Market Value There is no basis for such a drastic increase in our property's value as compared to comparable properties. How can there be such great disparities between homes that have always been comparables for our home- which has no special feature differentiating it from others in its class/grouping? Our immediate neighbors have "only" seen an increase of 40%. Their house, like all of the houses in our area, have always been appraised and sold at much much higher values than our home. They have recently added solar and done other improvements. We have not made any changes that materially affect the value of the house. There has been no new value created, no construction of new buildings; renovations or additions to pre-existing buildings; and we can't legally subdivide. There have been no changes in the property's permitted use. There have been no changes to the general finishes of the home with the exception of paint. Actually, the ravages of time have caused further depreciation of all the systems and parts that were noted as well beyond their life span at the 2017 town inspection, including a roof, heating system, hot water heater, and well pump well past their life expectancy. In addition there is further water damage, drywall issues, electrical problems, only one truly operable door, worsening concrete issues, the fireplace is inoperable, failed windows and problems with the shed (a tree growing into it) and the chicken coop (the floor rotting through and needs to have the opening fixed and doors attached). The land itself is of limited use. What isn't wetlands is ledge. There is only a small area of land extending

WHEN IT RAINS...



approximately 15' out from the house that is flat. Each time it rains water accumulates at a very high level here. There is no significant timber value due to the age and type of trees per the County Forester, who walked and assessed the property. There is no practical ability to put solar on the property because of the direction of the slope and limited sun exposure. We've had two local companies come out to assess. There is also no cell service and very limited internet, it goes out 10 times a day, and there are no other providers who will service the property. The property cannot be subdivided and cannot be put in current use. There are easements that are not noted on the Listers Card, for a Consolidated station and the neighbor also has a use easement for their driveway. And then there is our driveway, "Where plows fear to tread" that takes about six hours to shovel because we can't get plows to come. A plow has flipped off the edge of the driveway as has Kristine Williamson. Delivery drivers will also not come up. They deposit packages down at the side of the road. All of these factors influence fair market value and should be considered in any evaluation. In regards to our home they were not.

Comparable Sale Properties There are few comparable sales for our home in Norwich. These are the closest we could come within the town. All of these properties have always exceeded the value of our property's value across all metrics. All of these houses have had some updates and regardless of the age of the homes have newer systems and roofs than our home.

18 Tilden Hill. It sold for \$659,00 a couple of weeks ago. The 2024 Grand List Value was \$385,300. It is currently appraised at \$493,000, Building Value \$328,200, Xtra Features Value \$0, Land Value \$164,800. *The Listers in prior appraisals have always valued it more than our home.*

It is a 3 bed, 3 bath, 2223 SQ FT, cape home built in 1948 on a 2.3 acre property that is not walkable to town amenities. The lot level and sloped with both open land and woods. It has a flat backyard. It has working woodstove, and a pond and it has been updated in recent years. It is on a very steep road.

138 Tilden Hill. It sold in May of 2025 for \$680,000. The 2024 Grand List Value was \$430,400. It is currently appraised at \$597,200, Building Value \$416,800, Xtra Features Value \$400, Land Value \$180,000. *The Listers in prior appraisals have always valued it significantly more than our home.*

It is a 5 bed, 3 bath, 2800 SQ FT, contemporary home built in 1979 on a 1.53 acre property that is not walkable to Norwich amenities. The lot is level and private and stunning mountain views.

179 Beaver Meadow Road. It sold July 1, 2025 for \$695,000. The 2024 Grand List Value was \$422,500. It is currently appraised at \$759,000, Building Value \$427,300, Xtra Features Value \$2500, Land Value \$329,200. *The Listers in prior appraisals have always valued it significantly more than our home.*

It is a 4 bed, 3 bath, 2585 SQ FT, cape home built in 1953 on a .83 acre property that is walkable to the AT, the Library, Dan and Whits, and Marion Cross. The lot is level with a patio and deck.

Comparable Assessment Properties Although different styles of homes, all of these properties have similar levels of finish to ours and we know this because we visited these properties and actively considered buying and in some cases put offers in on these homes. With the exception of Ladeau. All of these homes were all listed as comparables at the time we bought our home and most importantly, this is actual factual data as to what the market bore. 324 Hopson is best comparable for our property. It is the closest to our home for value, size, finishes, although it has always exceeded the value of our home across all metrics with the exception of this contested appraisal.

324 Hopson Road. Kristine Williamson looked at the property in 2015. It was listed at \$379,000. We found out there was an offer on it, so we did not put in a bid. It was originally listed at \$429,000 in August of 2014. It sold in April of 2015 for \$356,000. The 2024 Grand List Value was \$368,500. It is currently appraised at \$442,300, Building Value \$230,100, Xtra Features Value \$2800, Land Value \$209,400. It is valued more than our home on every popularly used real estate website including Zillow, Redfin, and Realtor.com.

It is a 3 bed, 2 bath, 2037 SQ FT, ranch home built in 1965 (erroneously listed as about 1960) on a 5.6 acre property that is walkable to the AT, King Arthur and Marion Cross. The lot is level with both open land and woods. It has a working fireplace, a porch, a newer roof, and central air. This home is older than our home, but the systems and roof are newer than ours.

73 Ladeau Road. We looked at the property in 2008 and put an offer in on it, had an inspection done, and did not end up coming to an agreement. It was listed at \$279,000 please note this was during the recession. It sold in April of 2009 for \$240,000. The 2024 Grand List Value was \$329,300. It is currently appraised at \$465,600, Building Value \$297,600, Xtra Features Value \$15,300, Land Value \$152,700. It is valued slightly below ours on Zillow and Redfin.

It is a 3 bed, 2 bath, 2200 SQ FT, cape home built in 1972 on a 6.2 acre property that is not walkable to amenities. The lot is level with both open land and woods overlooking a beautiful body of water. It has an income producing apartment, solar, and a working woodstove.

435 Bragg Hill. We looked at the property in 2016. It was sold for \$410,000 in October of 2016. It sold in July of 2018 for \$488,000. The 2024 Grand Value was \$419,900. It is currently appraised at \$591,500, Building Value \$425,100, Xtra Features Value \$0, Land Value \$166,400. It is and always has been valued a much more than our home on every popularly used real estate website including Zillow, Redfin, and Realtor.com.

It is a 4 bed, 3 bath, 2890 SQ FT, contemporary home built in 1979 on a 2.7 acre property that is not walkable to the AT, King Arthur and Marion Cross.

The lot is sloped lot with both open land and woods. It has an income producing apartment. It has been updated significantly within the last two years.

22 Eagle Lane. Kristine Williamson looked at the property in 2016. It sold in July of 2016 for \$342,500. It sold in August of 2021 for \$455,000. The 2024 Grand List Value was \$331,700. It is currently appraised at \$507,100, Building Value \$332,500, Xtra Features Value \$13,600, Land Value \$161,000. It is valued more than our home on every popularly used real estate website including Zillow and Redfin.

It is a 3 bed, 3 bath, 1769 SQ FT, contemporary home built in 1980 on a 1.6 acre property a little over a mile to town amenities. The lot is level with both open land and woods and very private. It has a working fireplace, cathedral ceilings, and a hot tub.

53 Glen Ridge Road. We looked at the property in 2015. It sold in March of 2015 for \$290,000. It sold in September of 2017 for \$350,000. It sold for \$378,000 in July of 2020. The 2024 Grand List Value was \$353,900. It is currently appraised at \$523,600, Building Value \$361,700, Xtra Features Value \$700, Land Value \$161,200. It is valued similar to our home popular real estate website including Zillow and Redfin.

It is a 3 bed, 2.25 bath, 1960 SQ FT, colonial home built in 1979 on a 1.22 acre property that is walkable to the AT, King Arthur and Marion Cross. The lot is level with both open land and woods. It has a working woodstove and has more recently been updated.

Our home, **1415 Beaver Meadow Road**, repeated here for comparison purposes, was originally listed at \$439,000 in April of 2016. It sold (to us) in July of 2016 for \$355,000. The 2024 Grand List Value was \$355,000. It is currently appraised at \$658,000, Building Value \$434,300, Xtra Features Value \$1700, Land Value \$222,000.

Our house is a 3 bed, 2.25 bath, 2240 SQ FT, colonial home built in 1993 on a 6.3 acre property that is not walkable to any amenities. There are no sidewalks, the road is fast and busy with blind curves, and it is approximately five miles to Marion Cross. Our lot is extremely steep with very little open land, mostly wooded, and a large percentage of wetlands. We have a fireplace but it is inoperable needs to be relined and reappointed. We need to replace all major systems and the roof. We do not have any short or long range views.

Data Errors Problems, encumbrances, and issues with the house and property are not reported on the Listers Card and therefore, although significant, most likely have not been considered in the reappraisal. The Listers Card stated had stated that the driveway "needs to be recovered with gravel." It did not need gravel as it is not a gravel driveway. It is a paved driveway. We pointed this out it has now been changed to "driveway needs maintenance upkeep," It is still inaccurate. The driveway is degrading under the weight of the pavement. As was noted by the home inspector in 2016 and

by pavers who have come to give repair estimates, the driveway needs to be ripped out and redone or moved. However, relocating the driveway would be cost prohibitive because of wetlands, ledge, and other topographical issues. We were very surprised to find this factual error because it was discussed at length in the 2017 Reappraisal Grievance, the 2017 property walk through by the Listers, the 2023 KTR exterior inspection, the June 2025 Informal Hearing (during which pictures were provided) and the KTR June 2025 walk-through and again at the Hearing. The driveway is one of the biggest factors affecting fair market value of the property and yet it has not been considered and no adjustment has been made for it. Also, while the land values are given a 10% to 20% adjustment for topography, which does not pertain to the driveway, it does not accurately reflect the issues with the parcel around lack of additional building sites, lack of lumber, no open arable land, steep slope, no views, ledge, wetlands and water issues.

In addition to the data errors related to the driveway and exterior, the assessment has an incorrect valuation for the structure. The process starts with a basic price to build per square foot with adjustments for size and construction cost. The price seems to be at an amount on the high range compared to other properties studied despite the home being a square box colonial with a low pitched roof, no special attributes, *"builder grade or below materials"* and built with fewer windows. This amount is subject to an attempt to account for depreciation. The depreciation process seems to give little to any mind to the actual condition of the structures as almost all homes, including ours, seem to be shown as having "average" depreciation. It appears to be based almost exclusively on the age of the properties and does not take into account if upgrades or renovation have occurred. In our case the property is past the expected life for the roof, well, pump, and heating systems. The amount of depreciation appears to be arbitrarily assigned based on the age and not taking into account the actual documented conditions of the structure.

These data and process errors drive the valuation of the property resulting in too high of a figure being assigned to the property.

General Comments Our disagreement with the appraised value of our home is not based on some gut feeling or unfounded belief that it is too high. It is based on evidence and derived from experience, having been, as stated, through the Norwich grievance process before and having extensive knowledge of the Norwich real estate market. Additionally, we have worked on residential and commercial real estate and land use cases over the years in our capacity as attorneys.

We have toured/looked at dozens of houses in the Norwich area starting in 1997. We put offers on and did inspections on some of these properties. That is why we listed the houses above as comparables. We could only afford and thus looked at properties on the lower end of the Norwich market and are therefore acutely aware and very familiar with most of the properties that are in the same price range as our own. The properties listed as comparable assessed properties were houses we looked at to buy and they were in the

same category, size, condition, price range, as our current property. Further, we have also looked at more expensive properties over the last 5+ years while searching for a home in the area for Kirk's mother, Janet Williams.

We have interacted with many of the local real estate agents who conduct business in Norwich. Every single agent we ever interacted with, whether representing us or the buyer, stated the exact same thing that *houses in town are seen as more desirable and sell for much more than houses out of town. the closer you are to walking to school, Dan and Whits, etc the more a property is worth*. This was told to us many times over the years by long standing well respected realtors Evan Pearce, Leah McLaughery, Cheryl Herrmann, Linde McNamara, Berna Rexford and many others.

We all know that location significantly impacts a property's market value because it's a permanent and fundamental factor influencing a property's desirability, utility, and long-term value. Unlike features that can be modified, location cannot be changed and often accounts for a large portion of a property's worth. Accessibility and convenience to stores, restaurants, the highway, and the AT make in-town Norwich a more desirable than outlying areas. If you have the exact same property in-town and in West Norwich the in-town property will be valued higher. Further, houses with water frontage, scenic views, and other physical characteristics all play a role in determining a property's fair market value. Utility access or lack of infrastructure development can also increase or hinder value.

Assessing rural properties is particularly difficult. Rural tax assessments face unique challenges compared to urban or suburban areas, making accurate and equitable valuations a persistent problem. Rural areas often experience fewer real estate transactions, making it difficult to find comparable sales for accurate property valuation. Rural properties also exhibit a wider range of uses and characteristics, such as agricultural land, recreational properties, and mixed-use parcels. Accurately assessing the primary use and secondary uses, like farming operations or recreational amenities, adds complexity to the appraisal process. Additionally, rural properties frequently possess unique features like large acreage, unconventional home designs, and outbuildings, making valuation difficult. Accordingly, factors like topography, natural resources, and access to utilities also significantly impact property value and must be carefully considered during appraisal. Studies have shown that property appraisals tend to be biased upwards, especially in rural areas, leading to potential overassessment and disproportionate tax burdens for property owners.

One of the issues in the current reappraisal is that in-town homes were given a bump up in land prices, but that that was unfairly offset by depreciation, a factor that the KRT formula primarily bases on the age of the structure. Since in-town has many of the older properties and newer properties are on the outskirts the in-town properties are assessed lower than their fair market value. It doesn't matter if the older home is character filled and updated with a new kitchen, metal roof, and air conditioning.

All of these factors, good or bad, affect fair market value and should in turn affect Norwich's Reassessment. Under the KRT appraisal method they don't seem to. The KRT model does not comport to known fair market values in town, discounts Vermont buyers' preferences as shown by prior sales, disproportionately valuing newer houses over historic properties, classic over contemporary and rustic style homes, and amount of land over location. Chipboard and laminate in the case of our home are valued more than wood cabinets and soapstone or granite in neighbors kitchens and baths. A steep slope is valued over flat usable land. Views or lack of views and access to services and utilities are either ignored, as in our case, or overinflated in others. When looking at the town-wide reappraisal as a whole the formula KTR used has produced a Higgledy-Piggledy result that is in contrast to other well known and well accepted values, including Zillow, Redfin, and Realtor.com and prior Norwich Listers' assessments, not taking into consideration the unique features of individual properties, failing to account for condition, views, topography, and other physical characteristics, and incorrectly depreciating properties, assessing building costs, and grading properties. It not only flies in the face of common sense, but also drastically highlights the unfairness of our appraised value.

How can anyone have confidence in a process where the following buildings or land are appraised at significantly less than ours. If it wasn't so unfair, it would be laughable. **724 Bragg Hill** is a beautiful historic 2738 square foot home with high ceilings, impressive mill work, and wide plank floors built in 1835 on 22 acres. The building is valued at \$289,900. It has a historic barn that is appraised at \$900; one of its beams is worth more than that. This property also boasts a famous garden and arguably the best views in town. The total appraised value is \$845,800, far far below what any realtor would appraise it for. (Zillow estimates the price at double the appraised value.) Also note that Bragg Hill has the same neighborhood score as the Sharon end of Beaver Meadow in West Norwich. Again ask any realtor who has worked in town if that is the reality of the market. The answer is no. We've asked. They further noted that our area would be considered one of the lowest in town.

And yet, our neighbor across the street did not suffer from this neighborhood markup. **1448 Beaver Meadow** a 2960 square foot cape built in 1997 has a building value of \$84, 500. Apparently being powered by solar and alternative energy sources is not valued by KRT.

We've also asked a few realtors about two properties in town that we all drive by daily and have been to the businesses located there. Both of these properties would easily sell for over a million. **8 Carpenter Street** is a 1728 square foot colonial built in 1997 on .13 acres and is currently a commercial property. It has a lovely front porch and is in a prime location in the center of town. It's total appraisal is \$526,000. The building value is \$258,200. **306 Main Street** is a 1924 square foot white colonial built in 1940. It is in a prime location in the center of town next to town hall. It is currently used as a commercial building. It's total appraisal is \$671,200. The building value is \$303,500. Reasonable? Not when our building value is \$434,300.

What about land? 422 Hogback Road is a 2944 square foot colonial built in 2002 on 6.46 acres. It has large flat side yard, short driveway on a well maintained road in an area of horse properties. It is mostly wooded. It's total appraisal is \$936,400. The land value is \$174,300. 24 Bullock is a 1916 square foot colonial, used as rental units, built in 1990 on 6.9 acres of usable dry land most wooded. It has a short relatively flat driveway and much more flat area than our home. It's total appraisal is \$538,300. The building value is \$406,400. The land value is \$147,500. 63 Old Farm Rd is a 2400 square foot colonial built in 1989 on 6.32 acres. It is in an undisputed very desirable neighborhood with long views and has flat usable land It's total appraisal is \$634,500. The building value is \$422,200. The land value is \$177,000. 111 Chapel Hill is a 1614 square foot cape built in 1997 on 10 quiet acres not far from our home. It's total appraisal is \$552,800. The building value is \$345,600. The land value is \$147,500. Once again land that is flat, usable, and larger than ours but appraised much lower. Reasonable? Not when our 6.3 sloping acres is \$222,000. These are just a few more examples of how our appraisal is so out of whack. We can probably give you a hundred more. Please note once again, that in prior appraisals the buildings and lands highlighted have always been appraised high than ours.

Addressing the challenges of rural tax assessments requires acknowledging the unique characteristics of rural properties and implementing measures that ensure accurate and equitable valuations for all property owners. KTR failed to do that in the case of 1415 Beaver Meadow and throughout town.

The Listers would seem to agree. The Listers have admitted in conversations that *they didn't understand the KRT formula/algorithm* and that the process was *subjective*. Most legally damning, at the Listers' Special Meeting on August 15, 2025 and as reflected in the Meeting video tape and the Draft Minutes, the Listers Lodged the Grand List for the Town of Norwich "*under protest and with reservations*" based on concerns expressed during the meeting, such as: "*challenges centered around the land tables, neighborhood codes and influence codes that were not clearly defined*" The Listers further expressed "*frustration and disappointment in how data was collected, the low number of interior inspections done, errors on property record cards and the need for more collaboration throughout the process.*" For the Listers' to lodge the Grand List with a statement against interest they clearly do not have confidence in KRT's process or the Grand List. Why should you?

We ask that you to fully consider the many deficiencies presented and lower our property appraisal to bring it into line with known comparables like 324 Hopson and thus making our appraisal fair and equitable. Otherwise, the drastic unsubstantiated increase in our appraised value will cause us to bear a disproportionate share of the tax burden contravening Vermont law.

Signature Kristine D. Williamson and Kirk L. Williams

Date 8/29/25

Kristine Williamson and Kirk Williams 1415 Beaver Meadow Road

Property issues that negatively impact its market value that were submitted to Listers and KRT

Please note, in 2017, Listers/BCA and former contracted appraiser found property to be Builder Grade or less. While at home noted chipboard, painted laminate countertops/ laminate cabinets, hollow core doors that do not latch, hardware cast-offs, no upstairs windows on North only 1 on South, ect. They also noted the out of date systems such as the roof, water heater, well pump, and boiler. They made numerous comments about the slope and the driveway. Nothing has changed at the home since the last inspection with the exception of a few coats of paint.

Kitchen:

water damage interior of cabinet, drywall issues, countertops, floors worn/damaged

Bathroom:

1st floor toilet loose/not attached to the floor; flushes every other time

Hall bath: drywall issues

Bedroom bath: drywall issues on ceiling and nail pops; toilet getting loose from floor; GFCI not connected doesn't pop when tripped

Living Space:

Only one operable door to exterior

Mudroom closets door don't work; crack in tile;

Hollow core door doesn't latch

Drywall/wallboard seams/taping issues, buckling, and weird staining

Dryer vent on exterior gets stuck open

Floors need refinishing

Main bedroom. Window failed no quote for replacement

1 working door...\$30,000 ballpark quote 2 years ago.

Garage:

No safety rail on garage stairs

Both garage door panels (wood composite) are damaged at bottom; weather stripping needs fixing again; no safety cables; often cannot open them; none of the doors lock

Garage floor is cracked and some of the concrete is spalling, deterioration of a concrete surface

Water comes up over lip of back door

Electrical:

No junction boxes at lights, light switches in odd places, smoke detectors not hard wired and missing

Basement electric panel. 3 breakers that are double tapped

No GFCI in wet areas

Attic:

area above bathroom vent needs fixing wind wash causing moisture issues

Insulation is 10" should be at least 15" and none on hatch cover

Structure:

There is water damage to the subfloor and floor joists under the front door and the rear french door.

Foundation. Vertical cracks on center of front foundation wall and at left front corner; exterior water/algae

Joists/trusses. There are several holes drilled into the bottom of several joists that are too close to the bottom, should be in the center

Piers/post. No permanent post, just adjustable. The metal plates at the top of the adjustable posts are bent and have compressed into the wood

Basement:

Concrete floor. There are cracks in the front of the basement on the floor that extend most of the way across it and branch out near the chimney

Light fixture in left rear of the basement in-operable; junction boxes that need covers

Rigid foam insulation is damaged near ground and missing in places. It is 1" thick and should be 2" thick

Woodstairs no clearance

Fireplace and Wood Stove:

in-operable. Wood stove has always been unusable and fireplace needs liner, reappointing etc

Heating System:

Heater undersized for sq footage and well beyond the normal life expectancy for this type of unit

functional past normal life expectancy and no fireproofing over the unit

Circulation pump leaks at the bottom connection

Plumbing:

Water heater is very old past its life expectancy. 32 years on 10year

Well Tank. Pressure gauge doesn't function

Exterior Surface and Components:

Only one usable door to exterior

Front entry door deteriorating at the base on each side of the door. The rear french door is rotted through at each side of the base and the weatherstripping is torn and loose. Door from the house to the garage is rusting at the bottom.

Exterior surface we painted but nails are still backing out especially where there is exposure to the sun and some peeling on soffit that we have to continually touch up

Trim deterioration/rotted at the lower sections near garage, door surrounds

Fascia board at the left end of the garage roof front bottom edge is deteriorating

Outside outlet in front is not GFCI protected

Some failed windows

Roof:

Roof 33 years on a 20 year roof

Asphalt shingle roof is beyond life expectancy. Shingles are starting to lift and staples are backing out

Brick chimney moss near top of chimney which indicated moisture has gotten into the masonry. Weather cap and rodent screen missing, thimble cover in the basement missing. Chimney needs to be relined.

Lots and Grounds:

Steps/stoop. No safety railing which is required w/3 steps

Grading. Steep slope. The ground is sloping back towards the home in the front, on the right side, and in the rear of the home. Should slope 1" per foot away from home for the first 6'.

Trees: many downed trees

Slope, granite rock, wetlands

Unusable

"turn around"/hunter parking lot, lewd behaviors, pool water, grass sprayer

Waterfall hill

Pools at back door only working door

Driveway is very steep, heavily settled, cracked, and settled over culvert; at elementary school "oh the Grant's, you have the worst driveway in town." Child's college essay where plows fear to tread: his story about shoveling for 6 hours--plows come once don't come back, one flipped off the side, Kris went off the side, \$100,000 to resurface last a few years. To completely fix we were told more than our house.

Land has easements, cannot be put in common use, mostly wetlands, and ledge

Cannot have solar eastern slope even if cut down all our trees--we've had two companies come out and look at it.

Many downed trees on property causing damage this last year

Communication/internet

Only 1 internet provider and goes out more than 10 times a day

Phone does not work frequently old lines Consolidated inherited will try to get to within next 7-10 years which they and Fairpoint have been saying for 9 years...

No cell service

Neither EC Fiber and Fidium Fiber service are home we have called/had them to the property

























