



Connecting you with better values.
www.vallink.com

Request Overview

Name: JohnSmith Date Requested: 2026-05-16T21:37:26.135Z
Email Address: contactvallink@gmail.com Order ID: UKqqt11STsi698XicEjlaA

Assessment Appeal

Market Value Rebuttal Report (Assessment Appeal Support)

Subject: 1358 E Tomahawk Dr, Salt Lake City, UT 84103 (Parcel: 09-33-105-001)

Report date: May 16, 2026

Assignment goal	Provide a detailed, sales-supported rebuttal of the County Assessor’s market value conclusion and present a lower, well-supported indication of market value.	Intended use	Ad valorem tax assessment appeal / Board of Equalization support.
Property type	Single-family residence (per Assessor land use coding).	Condition (as provided)	Good; well maintained; no major updates in 10+ years.
Assessor market value (most recent provided)	\$2,581,300 total market value (market value year: 2025).	Assessor components (market)	Land: \$796,000; Improvements: \$1,785,300.

Value Conclusion (Opinion for Appeal Purposes)

Recommended market value (lower than Assessor): \$2,300,000

This conclusion is derived primarily from the Sales Comparison Approach using verified sale prices and living-area figures from recent market transactions, with adjustments reflecting effective age/updates, functional utility, and diminishing returns for very large homes.

1) Summary of the Rebuttal

- **Mass appraisal sensitivity:** For luxury hillside homes, small differences in effective age/renovation level can shift value materially. The subject is described as well maintained but **not substantially updated in 10+ years**, which the market typically discounts versus renovated comparables.
- **Data reliability concerns:** Public sources and the Assessor record reflect inconsistent core characteristics (e.g., effective year built and bedroom/bath reporting), increasing the risk that the Assessor’s model treated the subject as more updated or more functional than it actually is.

- **Sales evidence:** At least three recent sales (detailed in Section 5) support a value indication **below \$2,581,300** after applying market-supported adjustments (most importantly for condition/quality, effective age, and diminishing returns on size).
- **Key valuation driver:** The subject's combination of (a) large size, (b) older design era, and (c) no major modernization in 10+ years results in **superadequacy / diminishing marginal contributory value** for incremental square footage (a recognized market behavior in high-end residential valuation per accepted appraisal practice).

2) Subject Property Summary (from Assessor Data + Public Real Estate Portals)

Item	Summary
Address / ZIP	1358 E Tomahawk Dr, Salt Lake City, UT 84103
Neighborhood context	Greater Avenues / Arlington Hills area (hillside, view-influenced market).
Site size	0.4399908 acres (approx. 19,166 sq ft lot) per Assessor record.
Improvements (core)	2-story residence; year built 1986; brick exterior; central heat/air; attached garage.
Bedrooms / Baths (Assessor)	5 bedrooms; 4.0 total baths; 2 partial baths reported. (Public portals show differing bath counts; see Data Concerns.)
Living area / size indicators	Assessor "building_sqft" reported as 6,848; basement also reported (1,581 sq ft, with 1,400 finished). Public portals also report a larger "total" figure (likely including basement), indicating measurement definition differences.
Condition / updates (as provided)	Good condition; well maintained; no major updates in 10+ years (key to market reaction in the luxury segment).

Primary subject property portals reviewed: [Zillow](#), [Realtor.com](#), [Trulia](#).

3) Assessor's Market Value & Why It Is Likely Overstated

3.1 Assessor's conclusion being disputed

The Assessor's most recent provided **total market value is \$2,581,300** (land: \$796,000; improvements: \$1,785,300).

3.2 Practical concerns with mass appraisal for this specific property

1. **Effective age / renovation assumption risk:** The Assessor data reflects an "effective year built" of 2014, which typically implies substantial modernization or reconstruction. However, the property is described as having **no major updates in 10+ years**. If the model treated the subject as effectively newer/renovated, the improvement value will trend high versus actual market reaction for a dated-but-maintained home.
2. **Inconsistent bedroom/bath reporting across sources:** Public portals show differing bedroom/bath counts for the same address, suggesting that the underlying record feeds (and possibly the CAMA profile) may not be internally consistent. In high-end valuation, bath count and functional layout materially influence the buyer's price response.
3. **Area definition and finished basement treatment:** The subject's reported size varies depending on whether "living area" is measured as above-grade only or total finished area including basement. If the model's living-area input does not match how comparable sales were calibrated (or if it over-credits below-grade area), the resulting market value can be overstated.
4. **Diminishing returns / superadequacy:** For homes with very large total square footage, incremental size frequently contributes less than the average price-per-square-foot of the smaller, more marketable portion of the home. A mass model may apply a linear size factor that overstates the contributory value of additional area in this segment.

4) Valuation Methodology (Appraisal Institute–Consistent Framework)

Consistent with accepted appraisal practice described in Appraisal Institute methodology (Sales Comparison Approach principles), this rebuttal emphasizes:

- **Sales Comparison Approach** as the most relevant for owner-occupied single-family properties where sufficient sales exist.
- **Comparable selection priority** ranked as requested: property type, location, square footage, condition/quality, age/effective age, functionality, bedroom/bathroom count, garage/parking, lot size/site utility, then secondary features (pools, decks, basements, etc.).
- **Adjustment logic** focused on the dominant market reactions for this appeal:
 - Condition/quality and effective age (dated vs updated)
 - Size (recognizing diminishing returns at higher square footage)
 - Functional utility (bath count, layout efficiency, and marketability)

5) Comparable Sales Supporting a Lower Value

Sales below were selected because the sale price and living area were confirmable from public sales summaries. Source pages: [Homes.com \(84103 sold\)](#) and [Homes.com \(Metro sold list\)](#).

Comparable (Sale)	Sale Date	Sale Price	Sq Ft	Bed/Bath	Year Built	Why It Supports a Lower Value
Comp 1 342 Capitol Park Ave Salt Lake City, UT 84103	Jun 24, 2025	\$2,500,000	6,980	5 / 7	1998	Similar overall size segment with a confirmed sale price below the Assessor's value. After accounting for the subject's dated effective age/updates and functional differences, the indicated value trends lower than \$2,581,300.
Comp 2 825 N Juniperpoint Ct Salt Lake City, UT 84103	Nov 10, 2025	\$1,849,000	3,924	4 / 5	1982	Same ZIP sale reflecting market pricing for an older-era home in 84103. When adjusted for the subject's larger size using a diminishing-returns (marginal) area rate typical of the luxury segment, the indicated value remains below the Assessor's conclusion.
Comp 3 265 N Center St Salt Lake City, UT 84103	Jan 30, 2026	\$1,760,000	4,310	5 / 3.5	1903	Same ZIP sale with confirmed size and price. Even with upward adjustment for the subject's additional square footage, the resulting indication supports a value below \$2,581,300, consistent with

Comparable (Sale)	Sale Date	Sale Price	Sq Ft	Bed/Bath	Year Built	Why It Supports a Lower Value
						diminishing returns for very large homes and market discounting for dated condition.
Comp 4 (Support) 4484 Parkview Dr Salt Lake City, UT 84124	Jan 2, 2026	\$2,250,000	8,825	7 / 6	1981	A nearby east-bench market sale with substantially larger size but still a sale price below \$2,581,300. After downward adjustment for its superior size, it supports a lower value range for the subject (given the subject's lack of major updates in 10+ years).

5.1 Price-per-square-foot (simple, non-adjusted context)

Property	Sale / Assessor Value	Sq Ft	Value per Sq Ft
Subject (Assessor market value)	\$2,581,300	6,848	\$377/sf (approx.)
Comp 1 – 342 Capitol Park Ave (84103)	\$2,500,000	6,980	\$358/sf (approx.)
Comp 2 – 825 N Juniperpoint Ct (84103)	\$1,849,000	3,924	\$471/sf (approx.)
Comp 3 – 265 N Center St (84103)	\$1,760,000	4,310	\$408/sf (approx.)
Comp 4 – 4484 Parkview Dr (84124)	\$2,250,000	8,825	\$255/sf (approx.)

Note: Price-per-square-foot is presented only as context. The appeal conclusion relies on comparable analysis and adjustments, not on a single metric.

6) Adjustment Discussion & Indicated Value

6.1 Core adjustment logic (what matters most)

- Property type and market segment:** All selected sales are residential, and the primary set is within ZIP 84103 to reflect similar buyer pools.
- Location (micro-market):** Arlington Hills/Federal Heights hillside sites can command premiums for views and privacy; however, certain central 84103 locations also command strong premiums. Location adjustments in this report are conservative and subordinate to condition/effective age and functional utility.
- Size (diminishing returns):** In the luxury segment, the marginal contributory value of additional area is typically below the overall average \$/sf. The sales above demonstrate a spread where larger homes can transact at notably lower \$/sf (e.g., the 8,825 sf sale at ~ \$255/sf), supporting a marginal size rate materially below smaller-home averages.
- Condition/quality and effective age:** The subject is described as good and well maintained but without major updates in 10+ years. Market participants typically discount dated kitchens/baths/mechanical finish levels in this price tier. This factor is a primary driver of the downward conclusion.
- Functionality:** Bath count, layout efficiency, and overall marketability can cause two similarly sized properties to sell at meaningfully different prices. Where available data indicates a comp likely offers a more modern functional profile, a downward adjustment is applied to that comp to reflect the subject's dated functional utility.

6.2 Simplified adjustment grid (appeal-support format)

The grid below is intentionally simplified for assessment-appeal clarity. Adjustments are not presented as a USPAP appraisal form; rather, they explain the market logic supporting a lower conclusion.

Item	Comp 1 342 Capitol Park Ave	Comp 2 825 N Juniperpoint Ct	Comp 3 265 N Center St	Comp 4 (Support) 4484 Parkview Dr
Sale price	\$2,500,000	\$1,849,000	\$1,760,000	\$2,250,000
Sq Ft	6,980	3,924	4,310	8,825
Size adjustment (diminishing returns) Applied at approx. \$160/sf marginal for large-home increments	-\$21,000 (subject smaller)	+\$468,000	+\$406,000	-\$316,000 (comp larger)
Location adjustment	\$0 (same broader 84103)	+\$150,000	+\$75,000	+\$200,000 (subject hillside premium)
Condition / effective age adjustment Subject: good maintenance but dated; no major updates in 10+ years	-\$250,000	\$0 (older-era comp; treated as similar)	-\$150,000 (functional quality difference)	\$0 (similar-era; treated as similar)
Indicated (adjusted) value	\$2,229,000	\$2,467,000	\$2,091,000	\$2,134,000

Data sources for sale price and size: Homes.com sold summaries (84103 list and metro sold list).

6.3 Reconciliation

The adjusted indications range from approximately **\$2.09M to \$2.47M**, with the most size-proximate sale (Comp 1) indicating about **\$2.23M**. Considering:

- the subject's reported lack of major modernization in 10+ years (material in this buyer segment),
- the subject's large size (diminishing returns on additional area), and
- the subject's hillside location appeal (partially offsetting the dated condition),

a reasonable, supportable conclusion for appeal purposes is: **\$2,300,000** (rounded).

7) Additional Sales Considered (Not Relied Upon as Primary "Lower" Support)

7.1 Nearby Arlington Hills sale showing a renovation premium

A nearby sale on Tomahawk Dr (1464 E Tomahawk Dr N) is reported by Redfin as sold around April 16, 2025 at approximately **\$2,969,155** for **5,968 sq ft**, with marketing language indicating substantial updating and high-end amenities. This is informative as a "ceiling" indicator for updated properties, but it is not relied upon to support a lower value for a dated subject.

7.2 Subject's 2024–2025 listing history (price evidence, but sale price not disclosed)

Public portals show the subject was listed and later shown as sold in 2025, but the sold price is not disclosed on the portal sources reviewed; therefore it is not used as a confirmed comparable sale price in this appeal analysis.

8) Specific Requests to the Assessor (Actionable Rebuttal Items)

1. **Correct effective year built / renovation assumption:** Review whether the subject was modeled as "effectively 2014" (substantially renovated). If the home has had no major updates in 10+ years, the effective age should be revised to reflect market-observed depreciation and buyer discounting.
2. **Verify living area methodology:** Confirm whether the valuation model used above-grade area, total finished area, or mixed definitions. Ensure the subject and the comparable sales calibration are measured consistently (particularly for finished basement contribution).
3. **Functional utility review:** Confirm the bath count and overall functional profile used in the model, given conflicting public reporting. A mis-coded bath count can materially affect value in this segment.
4. **Apply diminishing returns for size:** Ensure the model's size factor reflects the market reality that additional square footage beyond a typical market threshold contributes less on a marginal basis (superadequacy). The supporting sales show materially lower \$/sf for very large homes.

9) Conclusion

Based on the confirmed sales summarized herein and adjustment logic consistent with accepted appraisal practice, the Assessor's market value of **\$2,581,300** is not supported for this property's **dated-but-maintained** condition profile and large-size diminishing returns. The sales support a lower value range.

Requested revised market value for appeal purposes: \$2,300,000

10) Sources (Public Portals)

- Subject property portals: [Zillow](#), [Realtor.com](#), [Trulia](#).
- Comparable sales summaries (ZIP 84103): [Homes.com](#).
- Additional supporting sale (Salt Lake City metro sold list): [Homes.com](#).
- Nearby Arlington Hills sale context (renovation premium example): [Redfin](#).

Important limitation (appeal-support report): This document is a market-value rebuttal prepared for assessment appeal support using public data sources and the property condition/update history provided. It is not represented as a complete appraisal report and does not include an interior inspection, plans, or independent measurement. Where public sources conflict, this report treats the inconsistency as evidence that Assessor modeling inputs should be verified.

Prepared by: Real Estate Appraisal Analyst (Assessment Appeal Support)

Signature on file (PDF execution)