

# ENGLEWOOD REASSESSMENT - 2026



# Why does Englewood have to complete a reassessment for the 2026 tax year? How frequently do towns have to complete reassessments or revaluations?

- In New Jersey, the state measures several statistical and non-statistical factors to determine if a municipality's property assessments are equitable, which could trigger a revaluation. A revaluation is ordered when assessments are found to be substantially below or above the required true market value
- In New Jersey, there is no set statewide schedule for when municipalities are ordered to complete revaluations or reassessments. Instead, a revaluation or reassessment is ordered by the County Board of Taxation (CBT) or the State Director of Taxation when a municipality's property values no longer reflect true market conditions.

# Annual County Equalization Table

Amended table of Equalized Valuations 2024  
(As Amended by Tax Court Appeals)

COUNTY AND DISTRICT		1 AGG. ASSESSED VALUATION REAL PROP. *	2 AVE. RATIO ASSESSED TO TRUE VALUE	3 AGG. TRUE VALUE REAL PROP. *	4 ASSESSED VALUE CLASS II R. R. PROPERTY	5 ASSESSED VALUE ALL PERS. PROPERTY	6 EQUALIZED VALUATION
	<b>BERGEN COUNTY</b>						
0201	ALLENDALE BORO	2,165,526,800	88.44	2,448,582,994	0	100,000	2,448,682,994
0202	ALPINE BORO	1,986,151,200	94.96	2,091,566,133	0	0	2,091,566,133
0203	BERGENFIELD BORO	2,742,171,800	59.04	4,644,599,932	0	87,730	4,644,687,662
0204	BOGOTA BORO	1,214,194,600	96.43	1,259,146,116	0	0	1,259,146,116
0205	CARLSTADT BORO	3,249,303,200	94.86	3,425,367,067	0	4,601,292	3,429,968,359
0206	CLIFFSIDE PARK BORO	3,049,694,900	68.46	4,454,710,634	0	5,472,231	4,460,182,865
0207	CLOSTER BORO	2,766,720,800	89.14	3,103,792,686	0	100,000	3,103,892,686
0208	CRESSKILL BORO	2,555,288,300	75.33	3,392,125,714	0	0	3,392,125,714
0209	DEMAREST BORO	1,388,946,500	64.32	2,159,431,748	0	82,810	2,159,514,558
0210	DUMONT BORO	1,692,955,440	56.25	3,009,698,560	0	0	3,009,698,560
0211	ELMWOOD PARK BORO	2,182,569,100	67.54	3,231,520,728	0	89	3,231,520,817
0212	E. RUTHERFORD BORO	2,819,519,400	93.60	3,012,307,051	0	4,694,817	3,017,001,868
0213	EDGEWATER BORO	4,288,742,955	90.22	4,753,649,917	0	2,064,100	4,755,714,017
0214	EMERSON BORO	1,219,198,500	70.99	1,717,422,876	0	0	1,717,422,876
0215	ENGLEWOOD CITY	4,558,366,000	67.85	6,718,299,189	0	0	6,718,299,189
0216	ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS BORO	3,557,113,800	85.99	4,136,659,844	0	1,644,861	4,138,304,705
0217	FAIRLAWN BORO	4,381,538,800	60.42	7,251,802,052	0	640	7,251,802,692
0218	FAIRVIEW BORO	1,699,019,500	81.58	2,082,642,192	0	1,574,245	2,084,216,437
0219	<b>FORT LEE BORO**</b>	6,701,355,230	68.83	9,736,096,513	0	9,265,952	9,745,362,465
0220	FRANKLIN LAKES BORO	4,547,845,200	73.65	6,174,942,566	0	0	6,174,942,566
0221	GARFIELD CITY	2,167,971,400	56.68	3,824,931,898	0	0	3,824,931,898
0222	GLEN ROCK BORO	2,459,289,200	71.58	3,435,721,151	0	0	3,435,721,151
0223	HACKENSACK CITY	6,648,391,100	80.69	8,239,423,844	0	0	8,239,423,844
0224	HARRINGTON PARK BORO	947,144,750	69.92	1,354,612,057	0	0	1,354,612,057
0225	HASBROUCK HIGHTS BORO	2,263,647,200	88.74	2,550,875,817	0	1,263,117	2,552,138,934
0226	HAWORTH BORO	860,333,100	67.80	1,268,927,876	0	0	1,268,927,876
0227	HILLSDALE BORO	1,713,869,800	69.26	2,474,544,903	0	0	2,474,544,903
0228	HOHOKUS BORO	1,202,832,700	68.31	1,760,844,239	0	100	1,760,844,339
0229	LEONIA BORO	1,244,919,300	61.02	2,040,182,399	0	642,232	2,040,824,631
0230	LITTLE FERRY BORO	1,517,815,000	86.84	1,747,829,341	0	100,000	1,747,929,341
0231	LODI BORO	2,019,470,200	56.96	3,545,418,188	0	68,660	3,545,486,848
0232	LYNDHURST TWP	4,483,900,500	88.16	5,086,094,034	0	5,329,097	5,091,423,131

# Who orders a town to complete a reassessment?

- In New Jersey, the [County Board of Taxation](#), the [State Director of Taxation](#) (through the [NJ Division of Taxation](#)), and even the [courts](#) can order a municipality to conduct a property revaluation or reassessment when assessments are not keeping pace with market value and are inequitable. A municipality can also choose to initiate the process itself if it recognizes the need to maintain tax equity within its borders.

In December 2022, the Bergen County Board of Taxation forwarded the City Tax Assessor its' worksheet to inform the City that it would likely be ordered to complete a revaluation due to the statistical data in 2023. The order was received in May, 2023.

BERGEN COUNTY BOARD OF TAXATION																											
Regulated Criteria for Revaluation Orders: in Accordance with N.J.A.C. 18:12A-1.14																											
Date: _____	Municipality: <u>ENGLEWOOD</u>																										
<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 60%;">Criteria</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Property Class</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. General Coefficient of Deviation (Average for all usable sales) [Deviation above 15% generally denotes lack of uniformity in assessments]</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>15.20</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Stratified Coefficient of Deviation (Average within a property class) [Deviation above 15% generally denotes lack of uniformity in assessments]</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>1. 0</u> <u>14.73</u> <u>0</u> <u>23.13</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Segmented Coefficient of Deviation (Average between property classes) [Deviation above 15% generally denotes lack of uniformity in assessments]</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>11.46</u> <u>14.75</u> <u>0</u> <u>22.98</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Assessment-Sales Ratio (Director's Ratio) [Declining ratios indicate a lack of assessment maintenance, less than 85% and compliance to adopted county percentage level]</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>76.38</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Individual Assessment-Sales Ratios (Listing of lowest to highest) [A wide divergence of ratios as, opposed to clustering, indicative of lack of uniformity]</td> <td style="text-align: center;">(1 SALE) <u>64.87</u> (303 SALES) <u>38.91 - 190.85</u> (18 SALES) <u>27.37 - 121.28</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>6. Class Weighted Ratios (Usable sales by class assessments divided by total usable sales of class) [Wide variances in class ratios indicate lack of uniformity]</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>64.87</u> <u>75.49</u> <u>75.49</u> <u>43.78</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>7. District Weighted Ratio (Total ratables of all classes divided by total equalized true value of all classes) [Compliance to adopted county percentage level]</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>71.54</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>8. Neighborhood and Zoning Changes [Must delineate impact on value]</td> <td style="text-align: center;">_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9. Lack of Adequate Records [Example: property record cards &amp; building permits]</td> <td style="text-align: center;">_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;"><b>NON-REGULATED CRITERIA:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>10. Last Revaluation or Reassessment 10 year life expectancy</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>2011</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>11. Reduction in Value from Tax Appeals Years of Reduction</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>10,087,400</u> <u>2021 - 2022</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Criteria	Property Class	1. General Coefficient of Deviation (Average for all usable sales) [Deviation above 15% generally denotes lack of uniformity in assessments]	<u>15.20</u>	2. Stratified Coefficient of Deviation (Average within a property class) [Deviation above 15% generally denotes lack of uniformity in assessments]	<u>1. 0</u> <u>14.73</u> <u>0</u> <u>23.13</u>	3. Segmented Coefficient of Deviation (Average between property classes) [Deviation above 15% generally denotes lack of uniformity in assessments]	<u>11.46</u> <u>14.75</u> <u>0</u> <u>22.98</u>	4. Assessment-Sales Ratio (Director's Ratio) [Declining ratios indicate a lack of assessment maintenance, less than 85% and compliance to adopted county percentage level]	<u>76.38</u>	5. Individual Assessment-Sales Ratios (Listing of lowest to highest) [A wide divergence of ratios as, opposed to clustering, indicative of lack of uniformity]	(1 SALE) <u>64.87</u> (303 SALES) <u>38.91 - 190.85</u> (18 SALES) <u>27.37 - 121.28</u>	6. Class Weighted Ratios (Usable sales by class assessments divided by total usable sales of class) [Wide variances in class ratios indicate lack of uniformity]	<u>64.87</u> <u>75.49</u> <u>75.49</u> <u>43.78</u>	7. District Weighted Ratio (Total ratables of all classes divided by total equalized true value of all classes) [Compliance to adopted county percentage level]	<u>71.54</u>	8. Neighborhood and Zoning Changes [Must delineate impact on value]	_____	9. Lack of Adequate Records [Example: property record cards & building permits]	_____	<b>NON-REGULATED CRITERIA:</b>		10. Last Revaluation or Reassessment 10 year life expectancy	<u>2011</u>	11. Reduction in Value from Tax Appeals Years of Reduction	<u>10,087,400</u> <u>2021 - 2022</u>
Criteria	Property Class																										
1. General Coefficient of Deviation (Average for all usable sales) [Deviation above 15% generally denotes lack of uniformity in assessments]	<u>15.20</u>																										
2. Stratified Coefficient of Deviation (Average within a property class) [Deviation above 15% generally denotes lack of uniformity in assessments]	<u>1. 0</u> <u>14.73</u> <u>0</u> <u>23.13</u>																										
3. Segmented Coefficient of Deviation (Average between property classes) [Deviation above 15% generally denotes lack of uniformity in assessments]	<u>11.46</u> <u>14.75</u> <u>0</u> <u>22.98</u>																										
4. Assessment-Sales Ratio (Director's Ratio) [Declining ratios indicate a lack of assessment maintenance, less than 85% and compliance to adopted county percentage level]	<u>76.38</u>																										
5. Individual Assessment-Sales Ratios (Listing of lowest to highest) [A wide divergence of ratios as, opposed to clustering, indicative of lack of uniformity]	(1 SALE) <u>64.87</u> (303 SALES) <u>38.91 - 190.85</u> (18 SALES) <u>27.37 - 121.28</u>																										
6. Class Weighted Ratios (Usable sales by class assessments divided by total usable sales of class) [Wide variances in class ratios indicate lack of uniformity]	<u>64.87</u> <u>75.49</u> <u>75.49</u> <u>43.78</u>																										
7. District Weighted Ratio (Total ratables of all classes divided by total equalized true value of all classes) [Compliance to adopted county percentage level]	<u>71.54</u>																										
8. Neighborhood and Zoning Changes [Must delineate impact on value]	_____																										
9. Lack of Adequate Records [Example: property record cards & building permits]	_____																										
<b>NON-REGULATED CRITERIA:</b>																											
10. Last Revaluation or Reassessment 10 year life expectancy	<u>2011</u>																										
11. Reduction in Value from Tax Appeals Years of Reduction	<u>10,087,400</u> <u>2021 - 2022</u>																										

# Englewood: Revaluation & Reassessment History

- 1994 – Revaluation
- 2007 - Revaluation
- 2011 – Reassessment
- 2026 - Reassessment

CALL TO ORDER:

SUNSHINE LAW:

ROLL CALL:

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: JULY 23, 2025

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT:

## 1. REVALUATIONS/ REASSESSMENTS

2026

ALLENDALE-	Reassessment-
BERGENFIELD	Revaluation-
CARLSTADT	Reassessment-
CLIFFSIDE PARK	Revaluation-
CLOSTER	Reassessment-
CRESSKILL	Reassessment -
DUMONT	Reassessment-
ELMWOOD PARK	Revaluation-
EAST RUTHERFORD	Reassessment-
EDGEWATER	Reassessment -
EMERSON	Revaluation-
ENGLEWOOD	Reassessment
FAIRLAWN	Revaluation-
FAIRVIEW	Reassessment-
FRANKLIN LAKES	Revaluation-
GARFIELD	Revaluation-
HARRINGTON PARK	Reassessment
HASBROOK HEIGHTS-	Reassessment-
HAWORTH	Revaluation-
HO-HO-KUS	Revaluation-
LEONIA	Reassessment
LITTLE FERRY	Reassessment-
LODI	Revaluation-
LYNDHURST	Reassessment-
MAHWAH	Revaluation-
MAYWOOD	Reassessment-
MOONACHIE	Reassessment-
NORTH ARLINGTON	Reassessment-
NORTHLAKE	Reassessment-
NORWOOD	Reassessment-
OAKLAND	Reassessment-
ORADELL	Reassessment-
PALISADES PARK	Reassessment -
PARAMUS	Reassessment-
PARK RIDGE	Revaluation-
KAMSEY-	Reassessment-
RIDGEFIELD	Reassessment -
RIVER EDGE	Reassessment-
ROCHELLE PARK	Revaluation-
ROCKLEIGH	Revaluation-
SADDLE BROOK	Reassessment-

SOUTH HACKENSACK	Reassessment-
TEREBORO	Reassessment-
UPPER SADDLE RIVER	Revaluation-
TWP. OF WASHINGTON	Reassessment-
WESTWOOD	Reassessment-
WOODCLIFF LAKE	Reassessment-
WOOD-RIDGE	Reassessment

While in New Jersey most districts do not reassess their property values annually, the assessments are measured for relevance annually by a study conducted by the Division of Taxation. The Division measures each 'arms length' sale against its' assessment and includes each sale in the study to determine the municipality's annual ratio.

YEAR	AVERAGE RESIDENTIAL ASSESSMENT	DISTRICT RATIO	INF. MARKET VALUE
2015	\$474,200	92.58%	\$512,206
2016	\$474,200	92.28%	\$513,871
2017	\$474,200	91.08%	\$520,641
2018	\$474,200	89.01%	\$532,749
2019	\$474,200	88.06%	\$538,496
2020	\$474,200	86.79%	\$546,376
2021	\$474,200	86.45%	\$548,525
2022	\$474,200	81.69%	\$580,487
2023	\$474,200	76.38%	\$620,843
2024	\$474,200	71.63%	\$662,013
2025	\$474,200	67.85%	\$698,895

The municipal ratio is determined annually and it is driven by residential property sales, as that type of property sells most frequently. While the ratio is updated annually, it is also applied to **ALL PROPERTY CLASSES**, which do not typically trend in the same manner as residential properties...this can lead, over time, to an imbalanced relationship in equity in how different property classes are assessed and taxed. It can also result in a municipality struggling to support assessments in appeal proceedings. A Reassessment recalibrates this relationship.

YEAR	COMMERCIAL ASSESSMENT	DISTRICT RATIO	INF. MARKET VALUE
2015	\$19,500,000	92.58%	\$21,062,865
2016	\$19,500,000	92.28%	\$21,131,339
2017	\$19,500,000	91.08%	\$21,409,750
2018	\$19,500,000	89.01%	\$21,907,651
2019	\$19,500,000	88.06%	\$22,143,993
2020	\$19,500,000	86.79%	\$22,468,026
2021	\$19,500,000	86.45%	\$22,556,391
2022	\$19,500,000	81.69%	\$23,870,731
2023	\$19,500,000	76.38%	\$25,530,244
2024	\$19,500,000	71.63%	\$27,223,230
2025	\$19,500,000	67.85%	\$28,739,867

Question: Will a reassessment increase taxes?  
We can look at other districts for answers.

BOROUGH OF BOGOTA

YEAR	ASSESSMENT	TAX RATE	PROPERTY TAX	INCREASE
2018	\$264,600	3.92%	\$10,372.32	
2019	\$264,600	4.02%	\$10,628.98	\$256.66
2020	\$264,600	4.07%	\$10,777.16	\$148.18
2021	\$264,600	4.14%	\$10,949.15	\$171.99
2022	\$264,600	4.23%	\$11,182.00	\$232.85
2023	\$264,600	4.29%	\$11,361.92	\$179.93

AVERAGE INCREASE	\$197.92
------------------	----------

# Example: Bogota – 2024 Revaluation Comparison (Before & After)

	<u>2023</u>	<u>2024 (Revaluation)</u>
<b>TOTAL RATABLE (ASSESSED) VALUE</b>	\$645,705,500	\$1,214,194,600
<b>AVERAGE RESIDENTIAL ASSESSMENT</b>	\$264,623	\$494,982
<b>TOTAL BUDGET (SCHOOL, COUNTY, TOWN)</b>	\$27,724,979	\$28,216,095
<b>TOTAL TAX RATE</b>	4.2940%	2.3240%
<b>AVERAGE RESIDENTIAL TAX BILL</b>	\$11,363	\$11,503
<b>AVERAGE TAX DOLLAR INCREASE</b>		\$140
<b>AVERAGE % TAX INCREASE</b>		1.23%

# Example: New Milford 2025 Revaluation comparison (tax rate pending)

	<u>2024</u>	<u>2025 (Revaluation)</u>
<b>TOTAL RATABLE (ASSESSED) VALUE</b>	\$1,607,097,800	\$3,138,797,200
<b>AVERAGE RESIDENTIAL ASSESSMENT</b>	\$332,718	\$643,161
<b>TOTAL BUDGET (SCHOOL, COUNTY, TOWN)</b>	\$64,831,517	\$68,358,141