

CITY OF CORUNNA APPLICATION FOR PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION
401 N. Shiawassee St., Corunna, MI 48817 989-743-3650

Please refer to the attached Department of Treasury Bulletin for guidance on requirements that must be met to be eligible for a charitable exemption under MCL 211.7o.

Please be aware that if you are granted an exemption, the assessor will annually review your status to make sure you remain in compliance.

PARCEL ID # _____ NAME OF ORGANIZATION: _____

PROPERTY ADDRESS: _____ MAILING ADDRESS: _____

CURRENT OFFICERS: _____ TITLE: _____

Under what sections(s) of the Michigan General Property Tax Act are you requesting an exemption?

Please state the reason you are applying for this exemption:

Are you currently receiving a property tax exemption? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, where and what type of exemption is being received?

Please attach the following documents with this application **(All information is required)**

- 1. **Articles of Incorporation**
- 2. **Proof of Ownership**
- 3. **I.R.S. Statement indicating status**
- 4. **By Laws**

Signature / Title Phone # Date

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Approved: Yes _____ No _____

Assessor Date

Audited _____ Date: _____ Results: _____



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY
LANSING

RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

NICK A. KHOURI
STATE TREASURER

Bulletin 26 of 2017
December 12, 2017
MCL 211.7o Charitable Exemption

TO: Assessors, Equalization Directors and Interested Parties
FROM: State Tax Commission
SUBJECT: MCL 211.7o Charitable Exemption

This Bulletin provides an overview of the charitable exemption provided in MCL 211.7o and the applicable court cases that need to be considered in determining whether or not a claimant is eligible to receive the exemption. While this Bulletin provides general information related to the charitable exemption, individuals may wish to seek legal counsel if they have questions regarding their specific situation.

A. STATUTORY PROVISION AND THREE-PART TEST

MCL 211.7o of the General Property Tax Act provides an exemption for “[r]eal or personal property owned and occupied by a nonprofit charitable institution while occupied by that . . . institution solely for the purposes for which that . . . institution was incorporated.” In determining whether a taxpayer is qualified for the exemption, a three-part test is applied:

1. Is the real estate owned and occupied by the exemption claimant?
2. Is the exemption claimant a nonprofit charitable institution?
3. Is the buildings and other property thereon occupied by the claimant solely for the purposes for which the claimant was incorporated?

If all three prongs of the test are met, then a claimant qualifies for a charitable institution exemption.

To meet the first prong, the mere right to occupy a property is insufficient, as is the mere planning and preparation to occupy a property; rather, a claimant must maintain a regular physical presence on the property to satisfy this requirement. See *Liberty Hill Housing Corp v City of Livonia*, 480 Mich 44 (2008).

To meet the second prong, all six *Wexford* factors must be met. The *Wexford* factors are discussed below in Section B.

With regard to the third prong, property may be apportioned for purposes of this exemption. In such instances, the exemption is granted only for that portion of the premises used for the purpose for which the claimant was incorporated. See *McFarlan Home v City of Flint*, 105 Mich App 728 (1981). Apportionment is only permitted in the case of real property and that the apportionment must be based on an allocation that grants the exempt status only to the portion of the premises which is physically occupied “solely” for the exempt charitable purpose.

B. WEXFORD FACTORS

In *Wexford Medical Group v Cadillac*, 474 Mich 192; 713 NW2d 734 (2006) the Michigan Supreme Court set forth the following six requirements that must be met for a claimant to be a nonprofit charitable institution:

1. The claimant must be a nonprofit institution;
2. The claimant must be organized chiefly, if not solely for charity;
3. The claimant must not offer its charity on a discriminatory basis by choosing who among the group it purports to serve deserves its services, but rather must serve any person who needs the particular type of charity being offered;
4. The claimant must bring people’s minds or hearts under the influence of education or religion; relieve people’s bodies from disease, suffering, or constraint; assist people to establish themselves for life; erect or maintain public buildings or works; or otherwise lessen the burdens of government;
5. The claimant may charge for its services as long as its charges are not more than what is needed for its successful maintenance; and
6. The claimant need not meet any monetary threshold of charity; rather, if the overall nature of the claimant is charitable, it is a charitable institution.

C. BARUCH SUPREME COURT DECISION

Wexford factor three was recently defined by the Michigan Supreme Court in *Baruch SLS, Inc v Tittabawassee Twp*, 500 Mich 345; 901 NW2d 843 (2017). The Supreme Court created a new “reasonable relationship” test to be applied when evaluating factor three; “whether the restrictions or conditions the institution imposes on its charity bear a reasonable relationship to a permissible charitable goal.” The Supreme Court instructed that this “reasonable relationship” test is to be construed “quite broadly to prevent unnecessarily limiting the restrictions a charity may choose to place on its services” noting that other states have employed similar tests. The Supreme Court further advised “the relationship between the institution’s restriction and its charitable goal need not be the most direct or obvious. Any reasonable restriction that is implemented to further a charitable goal that passes factor four is acceptable.” The Supreme Court also stated that the analysis of a charitable institution’s fees should be considered under factor five, not factor three.

Following the *Baruch* decision, the Court of Appeals issued a decision in *Chelsea Health & Wellness Foundation v Scio Twp, et al* finding that the facility under appeal was entitled to the charitable exemption and remanding to the Tribunal for entry of the order granting the exemption for the 2014-2015 tax years. The Court of Appeals, in granting the exemption, found that the evidence satisfied *Wexford* factor three as recently interpreted in the *Baruch* decision. The Court also found Chelsea Health lessened a burden of government “by undertaking measures designed to improve the health of the population within its service area.”