



STATE TAX COMMISSION OF MISSOURI

SHARON DASH,)	Appeal No. 23-10220
)	Parcel No. 07L330246
Complainant(s),)	
)	
v.)	
)	
JAKE ZIMMERMAN, ASSESSOR,)	
ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

DECISION AND ORDER

Sharon Dash (Ms. Dash) appeals the St. Louis County Board of Equalization's (BOE) decision finding the true value in money (TVM) of the subject property on January 1, 2023, was \$220,000. Ms. Dash alleges overvaluation and claims that the TVM as of that date was \$210,000.¹ Ms. Dash did not produce substantial and persuasive evidence of overvaluation. The BOE decision is affirmed. The TVM of the subject property on January 1, 2023, was \$220,000.

¹ Complainant timely filed a complaint for review of assessment. The State Tax Commission (STC) has authority to hear and decide Complainant's appeal. Mo. Const. art. X, sec. 14; Section 138.430.1, RSMo 2000. All statutory citations are to RSMo 2000, as amended.

The evidentiary hearing was held on March 6, 2025, via Webex. Ms. Dash appeared *pro se* via Webex. Respondent Jake Zimmerman, Assessor, St. Louis County, Missouri, was represented by counsel, Kevin Wyatt who appeared via Webex. The appeal was heard and decided by Hearing Officer Samuel Knapper.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Subject Property. The subject residential real property is located at 6 Meditation Way Ct, Florissant, Missouri with a Parcel ID of 07L330246. The subject property consists of a .39 acres lot and a single-family home built in 1989. The house has approximately 1,984 square feet of living space and includes three bedrooms and three bathrooms.

2. Assessment and Valuation. Respondent classified the subject property as residential and determined the TVM on January 1, 2023, was \$238,800. The BOE independently determined the TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was \$220,000.

3. Complainant's Evidence. Ms. Dash introduced 9 photos into which were admitted as Exhibits without objection. They are described as follows:

Label	Description
A	1 Photo of rear windows taken 6/25/23
B	1 Photo of fachia taken on 6/25/23
C	1 Photo of front porch taken 6/25/23
D	1 Photo of front porch

E	1 Photo of front porch taken 6/25/23
F	1 Photo of kitchen
G	1 Photo of kitchen
H	1 Photo of kitchen
I	1 Photo of exterior siding taken on 2/26/25

Ms. Dash testified that her opinion of value as of January 1, 2023, for the subject property is approximately \$117,000. Ms. Dash testified that one basis of her appeal is the change in the assessment values during her ownership of the subject property. Ms. Dash purchased the subject property in 2011 and the assessment was \$193,800. Ms. Dash testified that the assessment then decreased to \$167,500 where it remained until 2017 when it increased to \$175,700. Ms. Dash testified that the assessment of 2021 increased to \$197,600 and the assessment of 2023 increased to \$238,800. Ms. Dash testified regarding the condition of certain features of the home during her ownership, including: (1) adding a privacy fence in 2016, (2) the house has its original siding and needs to be replaced as there was a class action determining the siding was faulty, (3) the roof has not been replaced during Ms. Dash's ownership, (4) the kitchen is in need of \$43,000 of upgrades, and (5) her house has remained unchanged. Ms. Dash believes that her property is being compared to properties that have been improved to attract potential buyers and their condition differs significantly. Ms. Dash testified that another property in proximity to the subject property sold 'as-is' for \$210,000 and it was built one year after the subject property. Ms. Dash

testified that many features of the comparable sale were like the subject property and she would have to sell the subject property ‘as-is’ if she attempted to sell it.

Upon cross examination Ms. Dash testified that she presented the photos of the condition to the home when she had her hearing with the BOE other than *Exhibit I*. Ms. Dash confirmed that the BOE reduced the TVM of the property from \$238,800 to \$220,000 after reviewing the photos.

4. Respondent's Evidence. Respondent introduced Exhibit 1, the BOE’s October 17, 2023, Decision Letter. Complainant did not object. Respondent’s Exhibit 1 was admitted into evidence.

Respondent then called Thomas Keevan (Mr. Keevan) to testify. Mr. Keevan testified that he is a real estate appraiser employed by the St Louis County Assessor’s office where he has served in that capacity for two and a half years. He has worked as an appraiser since 1985. Mr. Keevan reviewed the comparable sale that Ms. Dash utilized in her testimony. Mr. Keevan stated that the sale could have been used in an appraisal analysis but that there were two aspects which would make inclusion challenging. First, Mr. Keevan testified that the sale occurred in June of 2023 so it may have been too far from January 1, 2023. Second, the transaction of the comparable sale was a flip sale and that those transactions typically sell for less than market value because the buyer must maintain their profits. Mr. Keevan also testified that the TVM of the subject property would remain the same after making property adjustments for square footage, the comparable was 135 square feet smaller, and the presence of a flip sale. Mr. Kevan testified that the comparable later resold on October 2, 2023 for \$346,000 and was listed in good condition.

Upon cross examination Mr. Keevan provided explanations as to why assessments change from cycle to cycle. He noted a market downturn when the assessment of the subject property's assessment reduced in 2013. Mr. Keevan testified that prices have increased since the pandemic. He also testified that the condition of the subject property is rated as fair and that the condition of the property has not been modified. Lastly, Mr. Keevan testified that the subject property would likely sell above \$210,000 because the comparable sale only sat on the open market for eight days.

5. Value. The TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was \$220,000.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Assessment and Valuation. Pursuant to Article X, Sections 4(a) and 4(b), Mo. Const. of 1945 real property and tangible personal property is assessed at its value or such percentage of its value as may be fixed by law for each class and for each subclass. Article X, Sections 4(a) and 4(b), Mo. Const. of 1945. Residential real property is assessed at 19% of its TVM as of January 1 of each odd-numbered year. Section 137.115.5(1)(a). The TVM is "the fair market value of the property on the valuation date[.]" *Snider v. Casino Aztar/Aztar Mo. Gaming Corp.*, 156 S.W.3d 341, 346 (Mo. banc 2005) (internal quotation omitted). The fair market value is "the price which the property would bring from a willing buyer when offered for sale by a willing seller." *Mo. Baptist Children's Home v. State Tax Comm'n*, 867 S.W.2d 510, 512 (Mo. banc 1993). "True value in money is defined in terms of value in exchange not value in use." *Tibbs v. Poplar Bluff Assocs. I, L.P.*, 599 S.W.3d 1, 7 (Mo. App. S.D. 2020) (internal quotation omitted). "Determining the true value in

money is an issue of fact for the STC." *Cohen v. Bushmeyer*, 251 S.W.3d 345, 348 (Mo. App. E.D. 2008).

"For purposes of levying property taxes, the value of real property is typically determined using one or more of three generally accepted approaches." *Snider*, 156 S.W.3d at 346. The three generally accepted approaches are the cost approach, the income approach, and the comparable sales approach. *Id.* at 346-48. The STC has wide discretion in selecting the appropriate valuation method but "cannot base its decision on opinion evidence that fails to consider information that should have been considered under a particular valuation approach." *Id.*, at 348.

The comparable sales approach "is most appropriate when there is an active market for the type of property at issue such that sufficient data are available to make a comparative analysis." *Snider*, 156 S.W.3d at 348. For this reason, the comparable sales approach is typically used to value residential property. "The comparable sales approach uses prices paid for similar properties in arms-length transactions and adjusts those prices to account for differences between the properties." *Id.* at 347-48 (internal quotation omitted). "Comparable sales consist of evidence of sales reasonably related in time and distance and involve land comparable in character." *Id.* at 348.

2. Evidence. "Although technical rules of evidence are not controlling in administrative hearings, fundamental rules of evidence are applicable." *Mo. Church of Scientology v. State Tax Comm'n*, 560 S.W.2d 837, 839 (Mo. banc 1977). The hearing officer is the finder of fact and determines the credibility and weight of the evidence. *Kelly v. Mo. Dep't of Soc. Servs., Family Support Div.*, 456 S.W.3d 107, 111 (Mo. App. W.D.

2015). “It is within the purview of the hearing officer to determine the method of valuation to be adopted in a given case.” *Tibbs v. Poplar Bluff Assocs. I, L.P.*, 599 S.W.3d 1, 9 (Mo. App. S.D. 2020). The hearing officer “may inquire of the owner of the property or of any other party to the appeal regarding any matter or issue relevant to the valuation, subclassification or assessment of the property.” Section 138.430.2. The Hearing Officer’s decision regarding the assessment or valuation of the property may be based solely upon his inquiry and any evidence presented by the parties, or based solely upon evidence presented by the parties. *Id.*

3. Complainant's Burden of Proof. The taxpayer bears the burden of proof and must show by a preponderance of the evidence that the property was overvalued. *Westwood P'ship v. Gogarty*, 103 S.W.3d 152, 161 (Mo. App. E.D. 2003). The BOE's valuation is presumptively correct. *Tibbs*, 599 S.W.3d at 7. The "taxpayer may rebut this presumption by presenting substantial and persuasive evidence that the valuation is erroneous." *Id.* (internal quotation omitted). The taxpayer also must prove "the value that should have been placed on the property." *Id.*

"Substantial evidence is that evidence which, if true, has probative force upon the issues, and from which the trier of fact can reasonably decide the case on the fact issues." *Savage v. State Tax Comm'n*, 722 S.W.2d 72, 77 (Mo. banc 1986) (internal quotation omitted). Evidence is persuasive when it has "sufficient weight and probative value to convince the trier of fact." *Daly v. P.D. George Co.*, 77 S.W.3d 645, 651 (Mo. App. E.D. 2002); *see also White v. Dir. of Revenue*, 321 S.W.3d 298, 305 (Mo. banc 2010) (noting the burden of persuasion is the "party's duty to convince the fact-finder to view the facts in

a way that favors that party").

4. Complainant Did Not Produce Substantial and Persuasive Evidence of Overvaluation.

Ms. Dash did not produce substantial and persuasive evidence rebutting the presumptively correct BOE value. Ms. Dash did not produce substantial and persuasive evidence to support her opinion of value of between \$210,000 for the subject property as of January 1, 2023. Ms. dash did not produce evidence comprising of a comparable sales approach, income approach, or cost approach to value.

The comparable sales approach is typically used to value residential properties improved with a single-family home. "The comparable sales approach uses prices paid for similar properties in arms-length transactions and adjusts those prices to account for differences between the properties." *Snider*, 156 S.W.3d at 347-48 (internal quotation omitted).

Ms. Dash testified about the several condition issues for the subject and the needed updates and repairs that are needed for the property. Pictures of the subject were submitted by Ms. Dash evidencing the alleged problems with the home. However, Ms. Dash offered no professional analysis completed by someone trained to analyze such condition issues and to show the deleterious effect they had on the property on the assessment date, January 1, 2023. Complainant testified that she presented these issues to the BOE. The BOE reduced the TVM to \$220,000 from the Assessor's original \$238,800 which tends to show that the BOE did take the condition of the home into consideration when reaching its value.

The lack of evidence relating to a recognized valuation method renders Ms. Dash's

proposed value speculative and unpersuasive. *See Cohen*, 251 S.W.3d at 349 (holding an opinion of value loses probative value when based on an improper foundation). Ms. Dash did not produce substantial and persuasive evidence showing the BOE overvalued the subject property and "the value that should have been placed on the property." *Tibbs*, 599 S.W.3d at 7.

CONCLUSION AND ORDER

The BOE decision is affirmed. The TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was \$220,000.

Application for Review

A party may file an application for review of this decision within 30 days of the mailing date set forth in the certificate of service for this decision. The application "shall contain specific detailed grounds upon which it is claimed the decision is erroneous." Section 138.432. The application must be in writing, and may be mailed to the State Tax Commission of Missouri, P.O. Box 146, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0146, or emailed to Legal@stc.mo.gov. A copy of the application must be sent to each person listed below in the certificate of service. ***Failure to state specific facts or law upon which the application for review is based will result in summary denial.*** Section 138.432.

Disputed Taxes

The Collector of St. Louis County, and the collectors of all affected political subdivisions therein, shall continue to hold the disputed taxes pending the possible filing of an application for review, unless the disputed taxes have been disbursed pursuant to a court order under the provisions of section 139.031.

SO ORDERED August 28, 2025.

STATE TAX COMMISSION OF MISSOURI

Samuel Knapper
Hearing Officer

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing has been electronically mailed and/or sent by U.S. Mail on August 29th, 2025, to: Complainant(s) and/or Counsel for Complainant(s), the County Assessor and/or Counsel for Respondent and County Collector.

Stacy M. Ingle
Legal Assistant