



**FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION  
ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD**

APPELLANT: Deanna Einbinder  
DOCKET NO.: 13-01119.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 06-01-206-016

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Deanna Einbinder, the appellant, by attorney Andrew J. Rukavina of The Tax Appeal Company, in Mundelein; and the Lake County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds no change in the assessment of the property as established by the **Lake** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

**LAND:** \$ 8,250  
**IMPR.:** \$48,033  
**TOTAL:** \$56,283

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**Statement of Jurisdiction**

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Lake County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2013 tax year. The Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of the appeal.

**Findings of Fact**

The subject property consists of a two-story frame attached townhome with 1,620 square feet of living area that was built in 2007. Features include partial finished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a 420 square foot attached

basement garage. The subject property is located in Avon Township, Lake County, Illinois.

The appellant submitted evidence before the Property Tax Appeal Board claiming overvaluation as the basis to the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted a refinance appraisal of the subject property estimating a market value of \$150,000 as of August 28, 2013. The appraiser developed the sales comparison and income approaches to value in arriving at the final opinion of value. Under reconciliation, the appraiser placed most weight on the sales comparison approach to value<sup>1</sup>.

Under the sales comparison approach to value, the appraiser identified three comparable sales and two listings. Comparables #1 and #2 were described as "REO" sales. Comparable #3 was described as an arm's-length transaction with conventional financing. Comparable listing #4 was described as "Short." The comparables had varying degrees of similarity when compared to the subject. The comparables are located in close proximity to the subject. Four comparables sold from March 2013 to June 2013 for prices ranging from \$144,000 to \$176,800 or from \$88.89 to \$109.14 per square foot of living area including land. Two comparables were listed for sale on the open market for prices of \$145,000 and \$168,000 or \$89.51 and \$103.70 per square foot of living area including land. After adjusting the comparables for differences to the subject, the appraiser concluded the subject property had a market value of \$150,000 or \$92.59 per square foot of living area including land. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested the subject's assessment be reduced to reflect the appraised value.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject property's final assessment of \$56,283 was disclosed. The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$169,323 or \$104.52 per square foot of living area including land when applying Lake County's 2013 three-year average median level of assessment of 33.24%. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(c)(1).

In response to the appeal, the board of review evidence shows appraisal comparable #5 sold in September 2013 for \$160,000 or \$98.77 per square foot of living area including land.

In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted four suggested comparable sales located in close

---

<sup>1</sup> Since the appraiser placed most weight on the sales comparison approach, the Board does not need to fully analyze or address the income approach to value.

proximity to the subject. One comparable was also used by the appellant's appraiser. The comparables were similar if not identical to the subject in age, size and features. They sold from May 2012 to January 2013 for prices ranging from \$150,000 to \$175,000 or from \$92.59 to \$108.02 per square foot of living area including land. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

### Conclusion of Law

The appellant contends the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in its assessed valuation. When market value is the basis of the appeal the value of the property must be proved by a preponderance of the evidence. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). Proof of market value may consist of an appraisal of the subject property, a recent sale, comparable sales or construction costs. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(c). The Board finds the appellant did not meet this burden of proof.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value contained in this record are appraisal comparables #3 and #5 as well as board of review comparables #1 and #2. These comparables are located in close proximity and are similar to the subject in design, age, size and features. These properties were typical arm's-length conventional transactions. They sold from May 2012 to September 2013 for prices ranging from \$160,000 to \$176,800 or from \$98.77 to \$109.14 per square foot of living area including land. The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$169,323 or \$104.52 per square foot of living area including land, which falls within the range established by the most similar comparable sales contained in the record. Therefore, no reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The Board gave less weight to the remaining comparables due to the fact they were REO or short sales, which generally had lower sale prices than typical arm's-length market transactions within the subject's development. The Board further finds the aforementioned arm's-length transactions undermine the subject's final value conclusion as determined by the appellant's appraiser.

In conclusion, the Board finds the appellant failed to demonstrate the subject property was overvalued by a

preponderance of the evidence. Therefore, no reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

This is a final administrative decision of the Property Tax Appeal Board which is subject to review in the Circuit Court or Appellate Court under the provisions of the Administrative Review Law (735 ILCS 5/3-101 et seq.) and section 16-195 of the Property Tax Code.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

*K. L. Fan*

*Klaus Albrecht*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member

*JR*

*Jerry White*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Acting Member

*Robert Steffen*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Acting Member

DISSENTING: \_\_\_\_\_

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

As Clerk of the Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board and the keeper of the Records thereof, I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full and complete Final Administrative Decision of the Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board issued this date in the above entitled appeal, now of record in this said office.

Date: November 20, 2015

*A. Proctor*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of the Property Tax Appeal Board

**IMPORTANT NOTICE**

Section 16-185 of the Property Tax Code provides in part:

"If the Property Tax Appeal Board renders a decision lowering the assessment of a particular parcel after the deadline for filing complaints with the Board of Review or after adjournment of the session of the Board of Review at which assessments for the subsequent year are being considered, the taxpayer may, within 30 days after the date of written notice of the Property Tax Appeal Board's decision, appeal the assessment for the subsequent year directly to the Property Tax Appeal Board."

In order to comply with the above provision, YOU MUST FILE A PETITION AND EVIDENCE WITH THE PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THE ENCLOSED DECISION IN ORDER TO APPEAL THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPERTY FOR THE SUBSEQUENT YEAR.

Based upon the issuance of a lowered assessment by the Property Tax Appeal Board, the refund of paid property taxes is the responsibility of your County Treasurer. Please contact that office with any questions you may have regarding the refund of paid property taxes.