

TOWN OF HOLLAND BOARD OF REVIEW
OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE 2025 BOARD OF REVIEW MEETING
HOLLAND TOWN HALL, W3005 COUNTY ROAD G, CEDAR GROVE, WI 53013
Wednesday, October 15, 2025 at 6:30pm

1. Call to order and meeting recording announcement:

The 2025 Holland Board of Review (BOR) meeting was called to order at 6:30pm on Wednesday, October 15, 2025, at the Holland Town Hall by Town Chairman David Huenink. Chair Huenink announced that the meeting recording was in progress.

2. Roll call:

- a. Members present: David Huenink, Gordon Seegert III, Douglas Hamilton, Brody Stapel, and Janelle Kaiser (member and clerk).
- b. Members absent: Kelly Caswell.
- c. Others present: Assessor Philip Rein and Assessor Nicholas Lair of Associated Appraisal.
- d. Members of the public that signed in: Joe Sanfelippo and Ken Sonntag.

3. Confirmation of appropriate BOR and Open Meetings notices:

Clerk Kaiser certified that the requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law had been met. A notice to reconvene on October 15, 2025 was posted on the front door of the Holland Town Hall on October 9, 2025. The meeting notice and agenda was posted at the Holland Town Hall and on the Town's website and was mailed by United States Postal Service first class mail to Jeffrey and Maria Bruggink and the Sanfelippo Trust on October 9, 2025.

4. Approve minutes from previous BOR meeting(s):

No action taken.

5. Objection Hearings:

a. Jeffrey and Maria Bruggink, N1751 TeRonde Beach:

Let these minutes show that the hearing for Jeffrey and Maria Bruggink originally commenced at the October 8, 2025 meeting of the Board of Review. Whereas, the Board of Review meeting ended before the Bruggink hearing could be concluded due to another Town meeting start time, the remainder of the hearing was scheduled to be conducted during this meeting. Proceedings of the October 8, 2025 portion of the Bruggink hearing can be found in the Board of Review meeting minutes from October 8, 2025.

Motion by Stapel, seconded by Hamilton, to approve the request by Jeffrey and Maria Bruggink to testify by telephone at the October 15, 2025 Board of Review meeting. The motion carried by unanimous roll call vote. Brody Stapel: Yes; Douglas Hamilton: Yes; David Huenink: Yes; Janelle Kaiser: Yes; Gordon Seegert III: Yes.

Jeffrey Bruggink submitted an Objection Form for Real Property Assessment (PA115-A) for parcel 59006074070, N1751 TeRonde Beach. Maria Bruggink was present via teleconference.

Total current assessment valuation by the assessor is \$887,800 (Land Value: \$519,700 and Improvement Value: \$368,100) and is classified as G1/Residential. Clerk Kaiser swore in Maria Bruggink, Assessor Philip Rein, and Assessor Nicholas Lair who stated their names for the record. Maria Bruggink stated their address for the record.

The objector believes the assessed value should be \$649,750.

Chair Huenink provided a summary of what occurred during the portion of the hearing for Jeffrey and Maria Bruggink held on October 8, 2025.

Objector questions for Assessor:

Objector believes that land classified as wetland should be a 50% reduction in value rather than 30%. Questioned whether property record card information is handed out at Open Book. Assessor replied that property record card information is available at Open Book but is not handed out. Objector stated that they were not at Open Book hearings due to a loss in the family and being out of town. The property record card information from the assessor shows that wetland area on the parcel is 1.17 acres and an official map from the Town shows 1.38 acres. The wetland area on the parcel was not fairly and accurately assessed. The parcel has 0.28 acres of usable residential land that is left. The assessor indicated that an 8% discount was applied for the previously discussed easement. Objector is unsure how assessor decided what value of property is; objector stated that they have presented some comparable evidence that it should be less. Between the 8-foot easement and the small usable residential area, the assessment overstates the value of the lake frontage. Objector asked the assessor how the wetlands were valued at the end of September but did not receive that information, so objector did not know the value of the wetlands assigned by the assessor until the last BOR meeting.

Questions from BOR to Assessor:

Brody Stapel asked whether an adjustment had been made to the property's assessment following Open Book, to which the assessor replied that an adjustment had been made. The assessed value reflected in the assessment roll includes the adjustment made after Open Book.

Assessor Nicholas Lair stated that the highest and best use for the lot is residential use and does not qualify for the 50% reduction in wetlands, however, the 30% adjustment that has already been made is applicable, appropriate, and in accordance with the Wisconsin Property Assessment Manual. A 50% adjustment for wetlands is typically seen in agricultural zoning with swamp areas. The assessor is

taking into consideration the wetlands and the lack of use available for the property. An objection must be made to the total assessed value of the parcel; the BOR does not have the authority to adjust only the land or the improvement, but the total value.

Chair Huenink inquired about the acreage classified as wetland area, whereas the objector stated that the parcel consists of more wetland area than is shown on the assessor's record.

Objector stated that a map submitted into evidence, labeled "Exhibit A," shows the wetland acreage.

The assessor opined that the 30% adjustment for the wetland acreage is appropriate.

The BOR reviewed "Exhibit A" and the information provided by the assessor and noted that the "Exhibit A" does not label the wetland area.

Objector asked where the assessor sourced the acreage of the wetland area on the parcel, to which the assessor replied that the amount of wetland area on the parcel was not changed from the prior assessment.

The BOR discussed the wetland area acreage.

Douglas Hamilton asked whether the 30% adjustment to the wetland area was made to the 1.17 acres, to which the assessor replied that it was.

Maria Bruggink giving testimony:

The parcel is swamp and water in the wetland area. It is swampy. Voiced objection to not receiving a 50% reduction for wetland area.

The dwelling does not have a full basement, rather, it has a crawl space. The assessor's property record report indicates that there is a 1,152 square foot basement. This should reduce the valuation.

A \$3,750 foot per front foot amount is being used to calculate their opinion of assessed value from the appraisal entered into evidence, to include a small discount for the easement and that the usable residential portion of the lot is so small. It also corrects the wetlands to 1.38 acres. Reduced \$10,000 for lack of basement.

Assessor Nicholas Lair recommended an adjustment to reduce the improvement value for the property by \$29,700 in light of the information received that the dwelling has a crawl space, not a 1,152 square foot basement.

Questions from BOR to Assessor:

Brody Stapel whether the adjustment made after Open Book reflected a reduction in value for the aforementioned easement, to which the assessor replied that it did.

Chair Huenink closed the testimony, as there were no further questions or testimony provided. Neither the objector nor the assessor provided a summary of

their testimony.

BOR deliberation:

Chair Huenink said that the 8-foot easement limits the use of the property and that the assessor accounted for that in the assessment and reduced the assessed value of the land for that 8-foot easement area by 8%. The 1.38-acre wetland area presented by the objector seems more than the actual amount; the assessor reduced the assessment by 30% for the wetland area only, and the assessor stated that is a standard practice for R-1 zoned land. The 1,152 square foot basement is crawl space only, and the assessor recommended a \$29,700 reduction to the improvement value based on that new information.

Vice Chair Hamilton is comfortable with the 1.17 acres of wetland area presented by the assessor. The 30% reduction, versus 50%, reduction is understandable because if two residential units were allowed on a lot, then the back lot could be used more if buildable. The lot is maxed out as far as development and the 30% reduction is appropriate. Hamilton agreed with the recommended adjustment for the basement.

Brody Stapel moves, exercising its judgment and discretion, pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 70.47(9)(a), the Board of Review by majority and roll call vote hereby determines, Gordon Seegert III seconds:

- That the Assessor's valuation is incorrect;
- That the property owner has presented sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption of correctness granted by law to the Assessor;
- And hereby sets the new assessment at:
Land: \$519,700 Improvements: \$338,400 Total: \$858,100.

The motion carried by unanimous roll call vote: Douglas Hamilton: Yes; David Huenink: Yes; Janelle Kaiser: Yes; Gordon Seegert III: Yes; Brody Stapel: Yes.

The roll will be corrected in red ink to reflect the new assessment set by the 2025 Board of Review.

b. Sanfelippo Trust, N895 Marine Drive:

Joe Sanfelippo of Sanfelippo Trust submitted an Objection Form for Real Property Assessment (PA115-A) for parcel 59006078630, N895 Marine Drive. Total current assessment valuation by the assessor is \$1,178,900 and is classified as G1/Residential. Clerk Kaiser swore in Joe Sanfelippo, Ken Sonntag, Assessor Philip Rein, and Assessor Nicholas Lair who stated their names for the record. Joe Sanfelippo and Ken Sonntag stated their addresses for the record.

The objector believes the assessed value should be \$813,300 per the objection form submitted, however, stated during the meeting that the total assessment should be \$939,054 as shown the evidence submitted.

Joe Sanfelippo giving testimony:

I am the president of the Marine Drive road association. The emails I send to the road association make it all the way up and down the Town of Holland lake roads. I was disappointed more people didn't come to BOR. Some people were content with adjustments made after Open Book, but I am not content because the assessment is wrong. I'm asking the board to set my property, set the base 100 feet of frontage at \$575,000 for the raw land because I have 100.41 feet at 577,358; I have a 15% discount for wetlands and a shared driveway currently on the assessment. Carry that forward brings the land to \$497,054. The total assessment should be \$939,054.

Chair Huenink:

I received emails from Joe Sanfelippo as a resident that lives on Marine Drive. I think that I could act as chair for the hearing in an unbiased manner, but I am recusing myself from the deliberation and decision making in this hearing.

Joe Sanfelippo confirmed that he was okay with Chair Huenink proceeding with chairing the hearing.

Joe Sanfelippo giving testimony:

In the evidence, you'll see how the assessor calculated front foot and improvement subtraction. I've submitted a plot which shows 2 outliers. The assessor used six properties to come up with this \$860,000 100-foot base number and even if you look at that plot, four are well below the \$600,000 mark and then you have two outliers. The assessor did not request to go into the homes of the outliers to actually get a full assessment of the inside to make sure his improved value was correct. He just did the drive by and assumed. Both the homes, the outliers, were both fully remodeled in the last couple of years prior to the sale. The improvements are way undervalued, which then overvalued the land on those. Presented comp book of homes sales; there was a home on Claervue Shores, S Pine Beach Road, and Alexander Lane which he did not use. The Wisconsin Property Assessment Manual clearly states if you don't have enough properties, especially when you don't have vacant land; you can go outside the town. You do not have to stay in the Town of Holland and you do not have to stay within a certain time limit of 2022 to 2024. Everything is time adjusted and when people are buying lakefront frontage, they're not buying based on school districts or political districts, they're buying lake frontage. Like Marine Drive, for example - 60 to 70% are part timers. They don't have kids in school; they're buying the beach. So, whether it's Wilson or Holland or Belgium, it makes no difference to the buyer. So again, it should have made no difference to the assessor to move up and down the lakefront to get more properties to put in comp sheets. The Wisconsin Property Assessment Manual clearly states that comparable sales can come from surrounding municipalities and time of sale adjustments are standard, so you can use older and newer sales.

The assessor has a mistake on the frontage for a property on Idlewood, he's got it as 240 feet of frontage, but if you look at a lot size of 57,935square feet, it's impossibly 240 feet of frontage. So again, I don't know if this calculation carried through to a

spreadsheet or not, but there is a mathematical mistake if it did.
I would like to introduce my guest, Ken Sonntag.

Ken Sonntag giving testimony:

My name is Ken Sontag, and I own and operate Sheboygan Appraisal Service. I have been a real estate appraiser and assessor up until this past June for 46 years and have been an active appraiser throughout Sheboygan County, on many, many lakefront properties and have been licensed by the state of Wisconsin since licensing started in 1995. I used to work for the City of Sheboygan Falls for 42 years as their assessor and their building inspector also. Now I pretty much just run my own appraisal business out of my home and it's full time yet. I received numerous calls from lakefront property owners. I've done several appraisals along the lake, mostly in Town of Holland, some in Town of Wilson and they've been recent enough in in this capacity as being a January 1st assessment. Joe Sanfelippo asked me if I would act as a consultant rather than an appraiser, so I did not do an appraisal on this home; never been to his home. I did analyze completely the sales along Lake Michigan, Town of Wilson (Black River Area) through the Town of Belgium. I have a list of sales, 12 sales total, that were very usable and very applicable from all the way back from September 2022 and including up until August 2025. Three of the 12 sales are beyond the assessment date. One was February of 2025, the other two were more recent, so I have analyzed that also. I took the sale prices of these properties and I used the last year's assessment information for the improvement and equalize them to the equalized value. I took the sale price and added time adjustments before I made any other adjustments. I then took the improvement value of the assessor from previous year, equalized it, and took that off of the sale price; the residual was the land value which I divided by the front footage.

In the end I had a range from as low as \$3,056.00 dollars per front foot up to \$8,325.00 a month with. The \$8,325 was the Stokdyk Ingelse Road property. That high sale was well over market as far as I was concerned, that was one on Marine Drive also that indicated \$8,021 dollars. The one on the Alexander indicated only \$3,056, but it had 437 feet of frontage and 9 acres of land. I don't know what sales the assessor used in his analysis, but in as many appraisals that I've done over the years, the lakefront's volatile, everybody knows that up and down depending on water level, depending on economy, etc. In this analysis, when I took the sales that were just from the Town of Holland between 2022 and 2024, the front foot value \$5,750. If you looked at all the sales, including even present, there's not any, even though nine of the sales in Town of Holland, one is in Belgium and two are in Wilson. There were other sales that were in Belgium, but they had a lot of co-ownerships, so it's difficult to determine because they're in a beach setting with many houses on them. The value of those lots are different because they're separated by use. So anyway, the sales overall, if I didn't worry about date and after time adjustments after the value of improvements were taken off \$5,650 was the actual value per foot using everything. I don't know that it's fair to use

the 2025 sales; there's many of that occurred in Town of Belgium and it's in a different county and village. Appraising on the lake, if you are going to stick just to a Township, the hierarchy of appraising and assessing is the sale price of a property is its value. Unless that can be proven wrong, that's the value and that's going to be the assessed value and that's when our comparable properties. So if you don't have enough comparable properties in your own municipality, you've got to expand that horizon to adjacent municipalities. In this case, I think there were nine decent sales to use, and I don't know how many of the assessor used for the analysis. If you take the highest two and ignore the lower ones, that's not a fair representation of what the market is doing. My analysis ended up being that the value of the lots along the lakefront for a typical 100-foot lot is \$5,750. Now anything happens on these lots where any lake, any inland lake, any Lake Michigan property, a smaller parcel is going to sell for more per foot. If you have 60 feet of frontage compared to 100 feet of frontage compared to 200 feet of frontage, that 60 foot frontage is going to have a higher per foot value. The 437-foot parcel is all the way down to \$3,056 dollars. I don't know if that sale was used. It came with 9 acres of additional land, so you have to adjust also for the acreage before you take the front foot place. My representation for the property owner is that the property value for the lake frontage based on 100 feet of typical sandy beach frontage is \$5,750 dollars for a 100-foot lot.

Joe Sanfelippo giving testimony:

You have this appraisal in your packet, which is in the timeline of that Philip used for 2022 through 2024. It's from October of 2024; it is for three lots that are currently for sale on Marine Drive, but the appraisal was done in 2024. The appraiser set each of those three lots at 375,000, they're both, they're all three are 100-foot lots. So that is actually truly the fair going rate for 100 feet on Marine Drive right there. Spreading it out through whole Town of Holland, I'm happy to concede to the \$575,000 as a base 100 feet of frontage.

Assessor questions for Objector:

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

Was there any appraisal performed on your property at N895 Marine Drive?

Joe Sanfelippo:

There was not.

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

If I understand correctly, you are using your experienced witness' land value development and using our property improvement value to develop the value of \$939,054.

Joe Sanfelippo:

I'm using your improved number. And I'm using your plot of six properties you used in your comps and finding that average of \$575,000 for the land.

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

I would just note for the record in the development of their land value, the witness stated that they were using improvement values based off of sales, and improvement values that were established in 2013 during the last revaluation; the improvement values that he was using to subtract to develop his land values are outdated by roughly 12 years. Keep that in mind because we're establishing 2025 values, and the 2024 values that he mentioned that he was looking at and the assessed values that he was looking at – those values were established in the 2013 market in the last revaluation.

Joe Sanfelippo:

On the spreadsheet and the plot, I'm using the assessor's numbers to plot that. I'm using the assessor's numbers, not my numbers.

Ken Sonntag:

I understand that fully; I equalized the value to what your equalized rate is for those improvements, and it still would get there – they are all low. If a really nice custom built home only had an improvement value of \$125 per square foot, I adjusted that accordingly. Some of those properties were brought up to current building standards and what that home would bring in the market for the improved values, so they were equalized to the current market. They were not analyzed as a 2013 number. If I did use the 2013 number, that would also then lower the land value. After analyzing and changing my numbers on the improvements, I brought them to current market before I adjusted the land values. I also gave this property owner my number two hours ago. His number was not even based on my number. There wasn't anything that I said that this is what you should put down on the paper.

Joe Sanfelippo:

The evidence I have submitted does not reflect new numbers that I came up with today as it was previously submitted.

At this time, Ken Sonntag entered evidence into the record, to include his analysis of property sales with adjusted values and multiple listing service data sheets for each property analyzed.

Assessor giving testimony:

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

At this time, we will present the property record card for N895 Marine Drive, parcel number 59006078630. We are evaluating a waterfront property. This subject property is known to have an effective frontage of 100 front feet and effective depth of 299 feet. The current land assessment is \$730,600. The improvement value is \$448,300 for a total improvement value of \$1,178,900. The property is known to have a well and septic. The home was built in 1989, considered a single family, two-story with attic space and gas force air. It has a first floor square footage of approximately 1,188 square feet second floor of 768 square feet, and a finished attic of 916 square feet for a total of 2,872 square feet on the property. This property also indicates a full basement of 1,188 square feet and is unfinished. On the back page, you will see pictures of the aerial view and the

frontage. At this time, I can present some sale properties that have sold on the lake within the Town of Holland in the 2024 year.

Again, in the first row, we do have the subject property. Our first sale comp is tax key 59006075660 at N1345 Cottage Drive, Cedar Grove. This property sold in February of 2024 for \$750,000. Effective front feet is 110. This property was built in 1960 and is known to have two bedrooms, 3 full baths, gas forced air, and air conditioning. Comparable property number two is tax key 59006078191 at N567, Marine Drive, Cedar Grove. Property sold in November of 2024 for \$1,875,000. Indicated front feet is 150. It was built in 1978 with an effective year of 1999, indicating some recent or past upgrades to the home with a living area of 2,189 square feet. It does include basement finish of 762 square feet. This property indicates three bedrooms, three full baths with electric forced air and air conditioning. The third property is comp is tax key 59006078660 W1169 Stokdyk Ingelse Road, Cedar Grove. This property sold October of 2024 for \$1,750,000. Again, it has approximately 100 front feet, very similar to the subject, and is a modern two-story; year built was estimated in the 1900s, current effective year is 2023, indicating recent remodeling on the property and is in very good condition. The gross living area is approximately 2,126 square feet. It does have a partial basement of 1,532 square feet. This home has four bedrooms, three full baths, gas forced air, and air conditioning. After reviewing the comparables, I have an aerial photo attached of each one going in comparable order for your review of each lot. Making adjustments to the property, the average indicated value of the home is \$1,239,300 and the median value of these comparables is \$1,250,150. This range of comparable value related to the subject property does support the assessed value at \$1,078,900 I would note that the sales comparison approach is considered the best indicator of market value when there is sufficient, recent, and reliable sales data.

Objector questions for assessor:

Ken Sonntag:

You have 2,872 square feet in this building and you said there's a finished attic area of how many square feet?

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

I indicated I believe 900 and it would be the portion above the garage. It is a second level attic.

Ken Sonntag:

You have your subject property as average and next two is the average even though comp number two, you said was remodeled based on an age adjustment and then the last comp very good with no adjustment for condition involved. Why is there no adjustment for these condition when they're superior?

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

There is a \$11,800 adjustment for the age.

Ken Sonntag:

Very good average is quite a substantial adjustment. Typically, it's at least at least 10% of the sale price of that property. I would consider that that average rating should be better than average in the adjustment made because you said it was remodeled. Just because you took an age adjustment doesn't mean that you don't have to take the condition adjustment. That 900 square feet above the garage, if that's true, and is that the same quality finished area of what the rest of the house is? Typically, they aren't; they're bonus rooms or recreation areas. Did you guys see that or not?

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

Typically within the cost approach, that's valued at a different price per square foot.

Ken Sonntag:

No, it's not, unless you classify it as something different.

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

I would imagine the condition of the attic space is typical of the remainder of the home. I believe it's average quality. That would be an assumption. I guess we could ask the property owners.

Ken Sonntag:

I think those are major points. I think there's got to be adjustments for condition on these comparables to bring those indicated values downward. The land value is the other part of it. If you're still basing everything on an inflated per foot price of everything in the Township, those adjustments should be much bigger because you're starting with a number that's over market and you're dropping those down based on size and price. You're adjusting for what should be greater than what they are. Trouble is, you're going to have inflated land values throughout the municipality. If you started with that \$8,000 roughly a foot for a 100 foot lot, all the land values along that lake are going to be inflated and that's going cause difficulty in your assessment roll. It's not equitable between lakefront and non-lakefront even though that market is slightly different. The equitability portion of it shouldn't be. If you're looking at a difference of \$2,500 a foot and those adjustments aren't made properly, the adjustments you're taking off with frontage or even adding for frontage are too small. That's how you end up with inflated value.

Joe Sanfelippo:

Based on the information I received from Phillip, there was 6 properties that he used in his comps. Is that true or false?

Assessor Philip Rein:

Correct.

Joe Sanfelippo:

So of those six, how did you weigh them to get to \$860,000 per 100 feet?

Assessor Philip Rein:

By using the one nearest to your property. So, in the Longfield Shores neighborhood as indicated by the N567 Marine Drive sale.

Joe Sanfelippo:

So you used one home to determine the Marine Drive property values.

Assessor Philip Rein:

Using the best information available.

Joe Sanfelippo:

You used one home. Yes or no?

Assessor Philip Rein:

Correct.

Joe Sanfelippo:

Walk through the math for all of us. How did you get to that number from that piece of property?

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

We've presented sale comparables to the property that support the valuation.

Ken Sonntag:

Doesn't support it.

Joe Sanfelippo:

I've shown vacant land that was at that exact same time frame that shows the properties worth \$375,000.

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

A vacant land appraisal is not the same as an approved appraisal.

Joe Sanfelippo:

Your partner who was here last week with Phillip, not you. He said quote me land is land because you asked.

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

We're here presenting credible valuation based on improved properties that have sold.

I would love to see some of that evidence that would be presented to support your valuation, such as sale comparisons of improved properties that have recently sold. That is what the Wisconsin Property Assessor Manual indicates as the best indication of market value and is supported at the Board of Review through the hierarchy.

Ken Sonntag:

That's true, however, you have land value that is supposed to be valued as if vacant and available.

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

We're not here to discuss or argue the land value. We're here discussing the value of total valuation of the improved property related to market sales.

Ken Sonntag:

So therefore, it doesn't matter what the land value on anybody's property. You're just going to see the total is the total, and you're not going to make adjustments for a lot of different things the way it looks. Just because you come up with a number when you analyze at the basis of the property valuation for the land along the lake is different than the properties in this the Township, farmland, rural residential settings.

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

We developed the professional opinion of this improved home at N895 Marine Drive. Did you?

Ken Sonntag:

Not on the improved home, no, but based on my knowledge of the market, I would say it's too high, but I haven't been able to do that due to time constants. But I did analyze land value substantially, and when you start with the land value being too high, and based on the analysis I did, it's too high. That means everything in the town is going to be too high on land. And again, if you're making adjustments and numbers that start too high, you're not making the adjustments big enough to get market value. You're in a quandary because everybody's land on Lake Michigan in this Township is overassessed.

Joe Sanfelippo:

So just to reiterate, you used one comp for the Marine Drive land values.

Assessor Philip Rein:

For the Longfield Shores neighborhood. That's correct.

Joe Sanfelippo:

Can you explain why you only use one comp and didn't actually use all six and average them in? Why didn't you go outside the Town of Holland? Why?

Assessor Philip Rein:

It seems sufficient for one area of the lake frontage.

Joe Sanfelippo:

These dates would have to be time adjusted, but just so the board understands how home sales on Marine Drive have gone. Going back to 2020, two homes sold in 2020; one for \$850,000, one for \$800,000. In 2021, one sold for \$800,000. None sold in 2022 or 2023. One sold in 2024; that's the one he's using for \$1,875,000. Then one sold in 2025. We're not using 2025 numbers, but just to show you the pattern here that sold for \$800,000. The pattern is every home on Marine Drive except for a couple of outliers will sell for around \$800,000. I mean, that's what they are worth. So why did you pick the 2022 to 2024 only?

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

There are more recent sales. I would suggest 2020 sales are outdated and are not a representation of the market in 2025.

Joe Sanfelippo:

They are relevant because in 2025 a home just sold \$800,000.

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

2020 sales are not relevant in the 2025 market.

Joe Sanfelippo:

Did you use any depth factors in coming up with your comp number?

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

Correct, yes.

Joe Sanfelippo:

What was that factor?

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

At this time. I don't have that information in front of me.

Joe Sanfelippo:

So the improvement, subtraction valuation minus the land value minus extra features from your cost model, what base rate condition, quality, depreciation extras were used?

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

The adjustments are presented in front of you. The model is a hybrid cost/market approach.

Ken Sonntag:

I never got an answer as to why there's no conditioning adjustments.

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

I would note that there's an adjustment in the grade or quality of the home.

Ken Sonntag:

Quality is different than condition. If the quality is different, then you make that adjustment. The condition adjustment is a necessary adjustment. When you look at the valuation of property, location is fixed. That can't be changed. Everything else can be changed, such as quality of construction. If that doesn't matter, then why there's a custom build home charging \$300, \$320 per square foot to build where a tract home is only \$200, so the quality matters. Condition is not always necessarily equal or parallel to the age of home. Remodeled homes built in 1900s can come out looking brand new. So the condition of very good compared to average, condition is like location, quality condition, size and then all the other things. One of the main components when people looked at a home, it's main components of value of property. The condition of all. Everybody's looked at homes, everybody's bought and sold. Everybody knows that condition is going to be one of the major factors. You can't change location, but you can change condition, quality stuff can change sometimes.

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

Applying your estimated \$10,000 adjustment for overall condition...

Ken Sonntag:

I said 10%. That's \$171,000 on comp three.

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

And that would still bring that property over \$1.1 million.

Ken Sonntag:

You look at the land value being too low, the land adjustment being too low based on inflated number and that brings you right back down to where he is.

Questions for Assessor from BOR:

Douglas Hamilton:

We're talking about land values and there was reference to a property sold I believe in 2020.

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

But that's from their analysis. All these properties are 2024 sales.

Douglas Hamilton:

In 2020, the lake level of Lake Michigan was at a record high and it's now down about where its long term averages is. How much of an effect does lake level and the amount of beach have on property values?

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

At this particular time, none of that's involved with the sales of the property.

Douglas Hamilton:

In 2020 with property values, let's take a given piece of property. Would the property sale or the sale price be lower in 2020 because of the higher lake level and less beach available?

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

I could not answer if the sale values would be lower due to the water level. It would be my expectation that the values or sale prices were lower in 2020 compared to today because the market is stronger and in more demand for waterfront property in 2025 versus 2020.

Brody Stapel:

What number did you use for per foot frontage at N895 Marine drive?

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

I know that there is some adjustments applied to it for wetlands and an easement as well.

Brody Stapel:

For the total land or just for the frontage?

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

Total land. Waterfront property is based off of front footage and sales. If we took the land value and divided it by 100, you get a price per front foot.

Brody Stapel to Assessor:

Was there an adjustment given for the easement and shared driveway?

Assessor Philip Rein:

Correct.

Brody Stapel:

Is that similar to the last case like 8% to 30%?

Assessor Philip Rein:

No, it was just an adjustment made based on what the property owner said. The adjustment was a -5% for the shared driveway and a -10% for the wetland reflected in the current assessment.

Brody Stapel:

Is there a reason it's different than the last case that they wouldn't be 8% or 30%? I don't know how many wetland acres there are. Why would one property receive 30% and one 10% for wetland adjustment?

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

Potential amount of wetland related to the property.

Brody Stapel:

Is that easement for the shared driveway only in the corner of the property?

Joe Sanfelippo:

The shared driveway? Yes. I own the driveway, but I'm forced to share it with my neighbors. It's 75 feet by the driveway width in size. The agreement is not breakable unless we agree to break it, and he's not going to agree to break it.

Objector giving testimony:

Ken Sonntag giving testimony:

I would say Doug's correct with his analysis of 2020 prices. I've been appraising property on this lake for over 40 years and \$5,750 is as high of a number that has ever been used that I'm aware of. They've been down; at one time, they were \$4,500, they went back down to \$3,500. It's volatile enough that the lake levels do have an impact. The 2020 numbers do not have an effect on present value, the assessors is correct. I think the property owner was just looking at the longevity of ownership on the lake and what those prices have done. His analysis has is that it hasn't changed much where his particular location is, but they do change. They are volatile to the height of the water and the economy and a lot of things. I didn't place any emphasis on 2020-2021 sales and only have one sale from 2022. The assessor said they didn't either, so it's kind of a non-issue.

Joe Sanfelippo giving testimony:

Actually, I would like you to just read a paragraph so this this is in your packet, it's a letter to the assessor, but it's from the neighbor on Marine Drive. I think what it points out is that Associated Appraisal lacks the expertise to assess lakefront property.

BOR questions for objector:

Janelle Kaiser:

Can you please explain the calculations of value that you have on the sales comparisons submitted?

Ken Sonntag:

First, I took the sale price and increased it for time. After time adjustment was made, I took the assessed value of the land from last year's assessment roll and equalized it . When I equalize it, it basically takes your 67% and it makes 100% . I did a calculation dividing that number by the square footage and came to a price per square foot. Some of the prices per square foot seemed appropriate. Some of them did not. Many of them were about \$100 a \$125.00 a Square foot below what they should be. So that's where you brought the 2013 numbers to current values. So, the custom homes are a little bit less than custom; there's many different quality properties there in different sizes, different styles, so I readjusted these price per square foot and multiplied by the square footage and then took that away from the time adjusted sale price less land. Then I took the land value that was left and divided by the front footage of that property and came up with the number of between \$3,056 and \$8,325 per foot. Again, the \$3,056 was 437-foot frontage and the \$8,325 was the sale at \$1.75 million. So, they have quite a variation. I put them in line on the right hand column. First column underneath was all

the sales at \$5,750 regardless of age and location. The next one was 2022 to 2024 sales, except the 2025 sales I took out. The next one was just The town of Holland. Sales between 2022 and 2024. I think that was \$5,650. They are showing that you're not increasing rapidly as far as the value on the lake, even after the assessment date.

Summary statement from objector:

Joe Sanfelippo:

What I'm asking for is that you set my base land to \$575,000, still keep the 10% and 15% for the wetlands and the shared driveway, and then set my total assessment at \$939,054. I think it's clear, and the Wisconsin Property Assessment Manual clearly states, that you can go outside the Town of Holland, but more than that, the fact that you only used one property for Marine Drive to come up with \$860,000 is clearly an error. That was an outlier property. The three properties shown by the assessor is really irrelevant.

They took the three highest properties. Why didn't they just show you all nine and then show you comps on nine properties that were sold? I think it's pretty clear that the property is overvalued by the assessor, and I'm asking for the \$575,000 for the land and the total assessment \$939,054.

Assessor giving testimony:

Assessor Nicholas Lair:

In Wisconsin, the sale comparison approach is the preferred method for determining fair market value because it's grounded on actual market evidence. It aligns with statutory requirements and is endorsed as the most accurate reflection of market activity by the Wisconsin Property Assessor's Manual. I will also note that these sales were chosen because they were the most comparable to the subject property and all sales occurred in the year 2024, which we are looking at to establish January 1, 2025 assessment values.

BOR Deliberation:

The BOR found that the property owner presented testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the market area and that the attributes were satisfactorily adjusted for their differences from the subject and their contribution to value. The BOR also found that the assessor presented testimony of recent sales of comparable properties in the market area and that the attributes were satisfactorily adjusted for their differences from the subject and their contribution to value.

Property and values BOR relies on to make its determination as to fair market value:

N1345 Cottage Drive \$1,107,900

N567 Marine Drive \$1,250,150

W1169 Stokdyk Ingelse Road \$1,359,900

N2035 Pine Beach Road South \$590,200

N211 Claervue Shores \$614,760
 N2047 Pine Beach Road South \$750,750
 W1169 Stokdyk Ingelse Road \$1,771,875
 N1585 Idlewood Lane \$793,400
 N567 Marine Drive \$1,875,000
 N1623 Alexander Lane \$1,632,000
 9606 S Sandwood Lane \$2,385,250
 9504 S Sandwood Lane \$1,131,975

The BOR did not find that the assessment value should be based on other factors, other than the 15% reduction to the land assessment adjustment made by the assessor for wetland area and a shared driveway easement on the property. The most credible evidence submitted was adjusted sales of comparable properties. The front foot average of the comparable sales submitted by the property owner as evidence, showed sales of six value adjusted properties sold in the Town of Holland between 2022 and 2024 with an average front footage amount of approximately \$5,750 per foot. The subject property, N895 Marine Drive, has 100.41 feet of front footage according to evidence submitted by the property owner.

Brody Stapel Moves, exercising its judgment and discretion, pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 70.47(9)(a), the Board of Review by majority and roll call vote hereby determines, Hamilton seconds,

- That the Assessor's valuation is incorrect;
- That the property owner has presented sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption of correctness granted by law to the Assessor;
- That the property owner's valuation is reasonable in light of the relevant evidence;
- That the full value of the property is:
Land: \$490,754 Improvements: \$448,300 Total: \$939,054
- And hereby sets the new assessment at:
- Land: \$490,754 Improvements: \$448,300 Total: \$939,054

The motion carried by unanimous roll call vote. Gordon Seegert III: Yes; Brody Stapel: Yes; Douglas Hamilton: Yes; Janelle Kaiser: Yes.

6. Provide Notice of BOR Determination form to objectors who are present and/or direct clerk to provide notices via certified mail:

A notice of BOR Determination will be sent to Jeffrey and Maria Bruggink via United States Postal Service certified mail at the mailing address provided on their objection form. A notice of BOR Determination was provided to Joe Sanfelippo of Sanfelippo Trust in person during the October 15, 2025 BOR meeting.

7. Schedule future BOR meetings as needed:

The BOR reached consensus that the 2025 BOR will reconvene on Wednesday, November 5, 2025 at 4:30pm.

8. Adjourn:

Motion by Stapel, seconded by Hamilton, to adjourn the meeting at 9:43pm, and to reconvene the 2025 BOR on Wednesday, November 5, 2025 at 4:30pm; the motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

Let these minutes show that a hearing for Waterworks Family Limited Trust will be held on November 5, 2025 at 4:30pm; written notice will be provided to the objectors by Clerk Kaiser in a timely manner.

Respectfully submitted,
Janelle Kaiser, Board of Review Clerk
Town of Holland, Sheboygan County, Wisconsin

Let these minutes show that these proceedings do not represent a transcript of comments submitted during the meeting, unless specified by quotation marks.