



STATE TAX COMMISSION OF MISSOURI

KAREN ALAINE GREENBERG,) Appeal No. 23-11194
)
Complainant,) Parcel No. 19R440153
)
v.)
)
JAKE ZIMMERMAN, ASSESSOR,)
ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI,)
)
Respondent.)

DECISION AND ORDER

Karen Alaine Greenberg (Complainant) appeals the St. Louis County Board of Equalization's (Respondent) decision valuing the subject residential property at \$408,700 as of January 1, 2023.¹ Complainant alleges overvaluation and asserts the true value in money (TVM) of the subject property was \$360,000 as of the assessment date. Complainant did not produce substantial and persuasive evidence establishing overvaluation. The BOE decision is affirmed. The TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, is \$408,700.

The evidentiary hearing was held June 12, 2025, via Webex. Complainant appeared *pro se*. Respondent Jake Zimmerman, Assessor, St. Louis County, Missouri, was

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.

represented by counsel, Steve Robson. The case was heard and decided by Senior Hearing Officer Benjamin C. Slawson.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Subject Property. The subject residential property consists of a single-family home located at 1512 Royal Crest Court, Chesterfield, MO 63017. The Parcel ID number is 19R440153.

2. Assessment and Valuation. Respondent determined the subject property's appraised value was \$408,700 as of January 1, 2023. The BOE independently determined that the subject's appraised value as of January 1, 2023, was \$408,700.

3. Complainant's Evidence. Complainant offered the following exhibits. Exhibits A through K were admitted without objection from Respondent. Respondent objected to Exhibit L on the grounds of hearsay and lack of foundation. The objection was sustained, and Exhibit L was not admitted into evidence but made part of the record.

Exhibit	Description	Status
A	Photos of driveway cracks	Admitted
B	Photo of driveway crack	Admitted
C	Photo of siding above garage door	Admitted
D	Photo of shutters	Admitted
E	Photos of outdated interior	Admitted
F	Photos of walls upstairs that need repainting after mold remediation	Admitted
G	Photos of ceiling upstairs that need repainting after mold remediation	Admitted
H	Photo of gap at foundation	Admitted
I	Photos of patio cracks	Admitted
J	Photos of patio cracks	Admitted
K	Photos of patio cracks	Admitted
L	Appraisal Report of Christopher D Longmore for \$340,000 as of June 25, 2018	Not Admitted

--	--	--

Complainant testified that her opinion of value is \$360,000 for the subject based on sales in her area and the appraisal value in Exhibit L (which was not admitted). Complainant testified that Respondent and the BOE overvalued her property because the subject suffers from as to the numerous defects and issues that are evidenced in Exhibits A through K. Complainant testified as to all these issues

4. Respondent's Evidence. Respondent introduced Exhibit 1, consisting of the October 17, 2023, BOE decision letter for the subject property. Exhibit 1 shows the BOE valued the subject property at \$408,700 for the relevant assessment date.

5. Value. The TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was \$408,700.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Assessment and Valuation. Residential real property is assessed at 19% of its TVM as of January 1 of each odd-numbered year. Sections 137.115.1; 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). The TVM "is a function of [the property's] highest and best use[.]"

Snider, 156 S.W.3d at 346. "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. 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). "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).

3. Complainant's Burden of Proof. The taxpayer bears the burden of proof and must show by a preponderance of the evidence the property is 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" on the assessment date. *Id.* See also *Hermel, Inc. v. State Tax Commission*, 564 S.W.2d 888, 897 (Mo. banc 1978). "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").

Property owners are competent to testify to the reasonable fair market value of their property. *Cohen*, 251 S.W.3d at 348. However, if owner's testimony is based on "improper elements or an improper foundation[.]" it is not substantial and persuasive evidence rebutting the presumptively correct BOE value. *Id.* at 349.

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

Complainant did not produce substantial and persuasive evidence to support her \$360,000 opinion of value. Complainant introduced no evidence pertaining to a recognized valuation method. Complainant did not produce any evidence supporting a comparable sales approach, income approach, or cost approach.

The comparable sales approach is typically used to value residential properties improved with a single-family home like the subject. “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). Complainant did not offer testimony of an appraiser, nor an appraisal of the property as evidence of the TVM of the property as of January 1, 2023. Therefore, Complainant did not produce substantial and persuasive evidence showing that the subject property was overvalued based on comparable sales data analyzed by a professional knowledge and training.

Complainant is not a licensed appraiser. As a non-professional in the industry, Complainant’s lay opinion of value based on sales in her area is speculative and not based on an accepted approach to value. In order to prove overvaluation, the taxpayer must not only prove that the assessment is erroneous, but ***must also must prove "the value that should have been placed on the property" on the assessment date***. *Hermel, Inc. v. State Tax Commission*, 564 S.W.2d 888, 897 (Mo. banc 1978). Emphasis added. Concerning the condition issues with the subject property evidenced in Exhibits A through K, Complainant

provided no evidence providing a way to quantify the effect of these issues on value or showing the BOE value does not account for these issues when making its decision.

Complainant did not produce substantial and persuasive evidence showing that the BOE's value was incorrect, nor did he prove the TVM on the assessment date. Because the STC "cannot base its decision on opinion evidence that fails to consider information that should have been considered" under a recognized approach to value, *Snider*, 156 S.W.3d at 348, the BOE decision is affirmed.

CONCLUSION AND ORDER

The BOE decision is affirmed. The TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, is \$408,700.

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 October 30, 2025.

Benjamin C. Slawson
Senior Hearing Officer
State Tax Commission

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing has been electronically mailed and/or sent by U.S. Mail on October 31, 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