ASSESSOR BRIEF

RECEIVED
JULY 9, 2026
STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION

STATE

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

Case # 26-128 thru 26-157

Assessor Pre-Hearing Brief

SBOE Case Number: 26-128, 26-129, 26-130, 26-131, 26-132, 26-133, 26-134, 26-135, 26-136, 26-137, 26-138, 26-139, 26-140, 26-141, 26-142, 26-143, 26-144, 26-145, 26-146, 26-147, 26-148, 26-149, 26-150, 26-151, 26-152, 26-153, 26-154, 26-155, 26-156, and 26-157
Taxpayer Name: AMH NV18 Development LLC
Parcel Number / Account Number: Multiple
Assessment Year: Appeals include the 2026-2027 secured roll and 2025-2026 supplemental roll

Introduction

This appeal is a consolidation of cases with parcels owned by AMH. The subject property information specifically described in this brief is for the newly developed Blue Vista community, a 105-lot subdivision owned by AMH Nevada 18 Development LLC. Blue Vista is located near Hualapai and Blue Diamond Road in the Southwest valley and contains two-story single-family residences built in seven distinct floor plans ranging from 1,851 to 2,407 square feet. The Blue Vista community's total taxable value for the 26-27 secured roll is $48,525,992. Total taxable values and all neighborhood specific data for the other consolidated AMH communities can be found in those individual cases. This appeal, as well as other consolidated cases, concerns valuation only.

At the County Board of Equalization hearing, the Board determined that, based on NAC requirements and the evidence presented, the Assessor's valuation did not exceed full cash value. The CBOE recommended no change to the total taxable value and found that none of the homes classed at 3.0 warranted a reduction to 2.5. Based on this analysis, we recommend that the State Board of Equalization uphold the CBOE's determination for all appealed AMH cases.

Clark County Valuation

The properties are individually parceled single-family residences with total taxable value of $48,525,992. Individual parcel values fall between approximately $427,000 and $495,000, each with a base lot value ranging between $110,000 - $121,000 with variation due to lot size.

To verify the land component, base lot values were tested using mass appraisal analysis of three comparable neighborhoods, each demonstrating median land values of $115,000, $115,000, and $120,000. This analysis supports that the Assessor's base lot value of $110,000 does not exceed market value.

The Assessor applied the sales comparison approach to determine full cash value for each model type in the Blue Vista community. Indicated full cash values demonstrate that taxable values remain below market: Model 1 shows full cash value of approximately $475,000 compared to a taxable value of $427,000; Model 2 shows full cash value of approximately $521,000 versus $449,000 taxable value; and Model 3 shows full cash value of approximately $559,000 versus $476,000 total taxable value. None of the taxable values exceed full cash value.

Taxpayer Issues

The taxpayer raises two primary concerns. First, they assert that certain homes were incorrectly assigned a 3.0 quality class and should instead be valued as 2.5. However, the county's review found clear distinctions between the quality classes. Homes assessed at 3.0 exhibit additional architectural features such as second-floor pop-outs, recessed windows, decorative window panels, corbels, multiple roof cuts, arched patio openings compared to rectangular designs and increased exterior stonework. These elements support the superior quality classification.

Second, the taxpayer argues that the proper valuation method should treat the subdivision as a single income-producing property based on its corporate ownership and rental use. The county's review explains that this position has no statutory support. These are individually parceled single-family residences, and the sales comparison approach is both statutorily required and sound appraisal practice. Case law—including *Montage Marketing vs. Washoe County* (2018) and *Mingo Creek Investment LLC vs. North Carolina State BOE* (2022)—reinforces that individually titled parcels must be valued individually.

Nevada Law, under NRS 361.227(1)(b) and NAC 361.1295, grants a provision for temporary relief provided during the developmental phase of a subdivision. This allows for a "subdivision discount" to account for the absorption period of vacant residential lots. NAC 361.1295 gives guidance that a subdivision is considered "fully absorbed" when less than 10 parcels held under common ownership are "not sold, rented or occupied". The Blue Vista community, as well as the communities included in the other consolidated AMH cases, have been fully absorbed and do not qualify for the temporary subdivision discount provisioned under Nevada Administrative Code.

The county further analyzed seven portfolio sales and compared each sale's total price to the combined taxable value of the included parcels; in all instances, the taxable values did not exceed the portfolio sale prices or were reasonably close in value. This confirms compliance with full cash value standards.

Conclusion

There is a clear and supportable distinction between homes classed as 2.5 and those classed as 3.0. The statutory requirement to value individually parceled single-family residences using the sales comparison approach has been met, and the Assessor's methodology is consistent with appraisal standards and supported by case law.

At the February 23, 2026 hearing, the CBOE concluded that the Assessor's valuations did not exceed full cash value and recommended no change to the total taxable value of $48,525,992 as well the total taxable values of all other AMH cases. No evidence demonstrated that homes with a 3.0 quality class should be reduced to 2.5. We concur with the county's findings for the Blue Vista community as well as all other AMH appeals.

The recommended total taxable value for all 105 parcels in the Blue Vista community remains $48,525,992.

To ensure an equitable market for every homeowner in Nevada, we ask that the State Board of Equalization uphold the CBOE's recommendation that the Assessor's total taxable values do not exceed market value and that proper appraisal practices were used for all cases being appealed by AMH.