



Connecting you with better values.
www.vallink.com

Request Overview

Name: JohnDoe Date Requested: 2026-05-15T13:50:52.390Z
Email Address: Order ID: zQ4.JjYMRqW55BkL3VzzSg

Assessment Appeal

Market Value Rebuttal Report (Assessment Appeal Support)

Subject Property: 1204 Linden Ave, Nashville, TN 37212-4612
Parcel / Account: 000115612 (Alt: 105-13-0-433-00)
Report Date: May 15, 2026

Assessor Market Value Being Disputed

Item	Amount
Total Market Value (Assessor)	\$635,400
Market Land Value (Assessor)	\$400,000
Market Improvement Value (Assessor)	\$235,400
Market Value Year	2025
Assessor Last Update	12/18/2025
Publication Date	01/05/2026

Assessor data provided in the assignment prompt (Davidson County / Nashville).

Requested Outcome (Value Opinion for Appeal)

Based on verified, recent sales of comparable single-family properties and a sales comparison analysis consistent with accepted appraisal practice (Appraisal Institute methodology), the Assessor's market value appears overstated.

Conclusion	Amount
Indicated Market Value (this report)	\$605,000
Indicated Range (bracketing)	\$580,000 – \$630,000
Difference vs. Assessor	-\$30,400

Effective date assumption: This analysis is intended to support an appeal of the Assessor's stated 2025 market value (published 01/05/2026). Where a statutory valuation date applies, conclusions should be interpreted as reflective of market evidence in the most recent 6–12 months surrounding the assessment period.

1) Subject Property Summary (Assessor Record + Appraiser Interpretation)

Characteristic	Subject Property
Address	1204 Linden Ave, Nashville, TN 37212
Property Type / Use	Single-family residence (assessor land use standard: single family residence)
Neighborhood / Area	Assessor neighborhood code 28; Subdivision: Clemmons Sub
Gross Living Area (GLA)	1,454 sq ft (1-story)
Bedrooms / Bathrooms	3 bedrooms; Assessor indicates 2.0 total baths and also shows 1 partial bath (data inconsistency noted)
Year Built	1984
Site Size	0.230 acres (approx. 10,019 sq ft)
HVAC	Central heat and central air
Parking	Assessor parking spaces: 0 (functional/marketability impact in this submarket)
Secondary Features	Deck present (96 sq ft); open porch (52 sq ft); utility area (80 sq ft); 1 fireplace
Condition / Updates (client-provided)	Good condition; well maintained; partially remodeled in past 5 years
Zoning (assessor)	R8
Assessor Implied Price per Sq Ft (Total Market Value / GLA)	\$437/sq ft (=\$635,400 ÷ 1,454 sq ft)

2) Key Rebuttal Points Challenging the Assessor's Market Value

2.1 Mass appraisal vs. market extraction from verified comparables

County assessments are typically derived from mass appraisal models that may not capture property-specific factors (effective age, functional utility, parking constraints, roof type, and level of remodeling) with the same precision as a sales comparison analysis using the most comparable, verified market transactions. When tested against recent, verified sales of similar-size single-family homes in the same ZIP and nearby competing neighborhoods, the Assessor's indicated unit value of approximately **\$437/sq ft** appears aggressive for a ~1,454 sq ft home without confirmed off-street parking and with only partial remodeling.

2.2 Internal data consistency: bathrooms and functional utility

The Assessor record shows Bathrooms Total: 2.0 and also Bathrooms Partial: 1. While this may be a data formatting issue, the appeal record should reflect accurate bath count because bathroom utility is a material price

driver. If the home is effectively 1.5 baths rather than 2.0 full baths, market value would typically be lower than a true 2-bath comparison set (all else equal).

2.3 Parking / off-street utility is a significant value driver in urban Nashville submarkets

The Assessor indicates **0** parking spaces. In walkable, high-demand areas near Vanderbilt / Belmont / 12 South, the presence (or absence) of off-street parking/garage frequently affects buyer demand, functional utility, and marketability. If the subject lacks off-street parking, it competes at a discount relative to similar homes offering a driveway or garage.

2.4 Land value allocation appears high relative to comparable sale behavior

The Assessor allocates **\$400,000** to land (approximately **\$40/sq ft** of lot area based on assessor lot size). Recent sales of older single-family homes in the same ZIP show transactions where the *entire improved property* sold at or below the Assessor's land value alone, depending on condition. This suggests the land component may be over-allocated for this specific parcel, or that the total value is being driven by land assumptions that exceed what the market supports for this property's utility and configuration.

3) Comparable Sale Selection Criteria (Ranked as Required)

The following hierarchy was applied when selecting and weighting sales, consistent with generally accepted appraisal practice:

1. **Property type** (single-family residential)
2. **Location** (same ZIP / proximate competing neighborhoods with similar buyer pool)
3. **Square footage** (homes near ~1,454 sq ft)
4. **Condition / quality** (good / maintained; partial remodel preferred)
5. **Age / effective age** (older homes acceptable if condition/effective age is comparable)
6. **Functionality** (layout, parking utility, conservation overlays where applicable)
7. **Bedroom / bathroom count**
8. **Garage / parking**
9. **Lot size / site utility**
10. **Secondary features** (decks, porches, basements, fireplaces, etc.)

4) Verified Comparable Sales (Support for Lower Value)

Sales were verified through major public real estate platforms (e.g., Redfin, Zillow, Homes.com, Trulia) and are presented with key elements necessary for comparison: address, sale date, sale price, GLA, bed/bath, and major condition notes where available.

Comp	Address	Sale Date	Sale Price	GLA (sf)	Bed/Bath	Year Built	Notes (key comparison)
1	2807 Westwood Ave, Nashville, TN 37212	04/03/2026	\$400,000	1,392	3 / 2	1931	Sold as a fix-up/rehab opportunity (complete renovation needed). Demonstrates lower-end price boundary for small SFRs in the ZIP. Source: Redfin , Zillow .
2	2946 Primrose Cir, Nashville, TN 37212	12/29/2025	\$575,000	1,248	3 / 2	1941	Same ZIP; similar bed/bath utility; smaller GLA than subject. Supports value below the Assessor's total market value.

Comp	Address	Sale Date	Sale Price	GLA (sf)	Bed/Bath	Year Built	Notes (key comparison)
							Source: Trulia , Homes.com , Redfin .
3	506 Chesterfield Ave, Nashville, TN 37212	12/10/2025	\$537,500	1,288	3 / 2	Not shown	Same ZIP; similar bed/bath utility; smaller GLA than subject; sale price well below the Assessor's market value. Source: Redfin .

5) Sales Comparison Adjustment Analysis (Summary Grid)

Adjustments below are presented in a concise form suitable for an assessment appeal. They are intended to reflect how an appraiser would analyze comparability and reconcile indications of value using market-supported logic (size/economies of scale, condition/cost-to-cure, and site/utility where supported). A full narrative appraisal would include additional verification, inspection, and market interviews.

Primary quantitative adjustment applied: living area (GLA) adjustment at **\$250/sq ft** (conservative incremental adjustment recognizing diminishing returns in this market). This rate is used only to normalize the comparable sales to the subject's GLA, not to replace a full appraisal.

Condition adjustment (Comp 1): Comp 1 sold explicitly as a complete rehab/renovation opportunity; a **cost-to-cure** style adjustment is applied to reflect the difference between an as-is distressed condition and the subject's reported good condition and partial remodel.

Adjustment Item	Comp 1: 2807 Westwood (Sold \$400,000)	Comp 2: 2946 Primrose (Sold \$575,000)	Comp 3: 506 Chesterfield (Sold \$537,500)
Property type / location	Same ZIP; SFR. Considered competitive location. (No dollar adj.)	Same ZIP; SFR. (No dollar adj.)	Same ZIP; SFR indicated by platform context. (No dollar adj.)

Adjustment Item	Comp 1: 2807 Westwood (Sold \$400,000)	Comp 2: 2946 Primrose (Sold \$575,000)	Comp 3: 506 Chesterfield (Sold \$537,500)
GLA (sf)	1,392 vs Subject 1,454 Difference: +62 sf (subject larger)	1,248 vs Subject 1,454 Difference: +206 sf (subject larger)	1,288 vs Subject 1,454 Difference: +166 sf (subject larger)
GLA adjustment @ \$250/sf	+\$15,500	+\$51,500	+\$41,500
Condition / quality	Inferior (complete rehab needed). Cost-to-cure style adjustment to subject's good / maintained condition.	Not specifically described in sources cited. No dollar adj. applied in this summary.	Not specifically described in sources cited. No dollar adj. applied in this summary.
Condition adjustment (summary)	+\$175,000	\$0	\$0
Site utility (lot size / utility)	Smaller lot cited on platform (6,534 sf) vs subject (~10,019 sf). Upward site utility adjustment in summary.	Lot size not shown in cited sources. No dollar adj. applied in this summary.	Lot size not shown in cited sources. No dollar adj. applied in this summary.
Site utility adjustment (summary)	+\$25,000	\$0	\$0
Indicated Value (Adjusted)	\$615,500	\$626,500	\$579,000
Reliability / weight	Moderate. Strong verification and strong bracketing of "lower boundary," but sold as a heavy fixer (requires condition adjustment).	Moderate-High. Same ZIP; same bed/bath utility; requires fewer assumptions than Comp 1.	High. Same ZIP; similar utility; sale price materially below Assessor value; minimal special-condition commentary in cited excerpt.

6) Reconciliation and Value Opinion

The adjusted indications from the three verified sales bracket the subject around **\$579,000** to **\$626,500**. In reconciliation, greatest emphasis is given to comparables that require the fewest extraordinary assumptions while maintaining proximity and similarity in property type and utility. Comp 3 and Comp 2 carry the most weight due to being same-ZIP, similar bed/bath utility, and not being explicitly characterized as a severe distressed renovation sale (unlike Comp 1).

Final Indicated Market Value (Opinion)

\$605,000 (rounded)

This conclusion is intended for assessment appeal support and is derived from the sales comparison approach using verified online sale records.

7) Requested Assessor Action (Appeal Position)

- Reduce the Assessor's total market value from **\$635,400** to **\$605,000**.
- Review and correct the bathroom count data fields if misclassified (partial bath vs total baths), as this directly affects model outputs.
- Confirm and properly account for off-street parking utility (Assessor indicates **0** spaces), which can materially affect marketability.
- Re-examine land allocation (**\$400,000**) for consistency with observed sale behavior of similarly sized, older single-family homes in the same ZIP.

8) Sources (Sales Verification)

Links are provided as short source names (no long URLs displayed). Data presented reflects what was available on the cited pages at the time of research.

Item	Source Links
Comp 1: 2807 Westwood Ave (Sold 04/03/2026 \$400,000; 1,392 sf; 3/2; fixer)	Source: Redfin , Zillow .
Comp 2: 2946 Primrose Cir (Sold 12/29/2025 \$575,000; 1,248 sf; 3/2)	Source: Homes.com , Trulia , Redfin .
Comp 3: 506 Chesterfield Ave (Sold 12/10/2025 \$537,500; 1,288 sf; 3/2)	Source: Redfin .
Market context (ZIP-level trends referenced in narrative)	Source: Redfin , Realtor.com .

Certification / Limiting Conditions (Summary): This document is an appraisal-style rebuttal prepared for property tax assessment appeal support. It is not a full URAR appraisal and does not include an interior inspection, plan measurement verification, or complete market extraction study. The analysis relies on Assessor-provided subject data and publicly available online sale records cited above.

Prepared by: **Real Estate Appraisal Analyst (Assessment Rebuttal)**