



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

APPELLANT: Christopher & Stacey Luber
DOCKET NO.: 14-00019.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 13-2-21-22-07-202-023

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Christopher & Stacey Luber, the appellants; and the Madison County Board of Review.

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

LAND: \$15,000
IMPR.: \$65,000
TOTAL: \$80,000

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellants timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Madison County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2014 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 is improved with a two-story single family dwelling of brick and vinyl exterior construction with 2,600 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1997 and is approximately 17 years old. Features of the home include a full basement that is partially finished, central air conditioning, one fireplace and a three-car attached garage with 800 square feet of building area. The property has a 13,967 square foot site and is located in Collinsville, Collinsville Township, Madison County.

The appellants contend overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellants submitted an appraisal estimating the subject property had a market value of \$195,000 as of August 18, 2014. The appraisal was prepared by Sandra Bova, a certified residential real estate appraiser. In estimating the market value of the subject property the appraiser developed the sales comparison approach to value using six comparable sales improved with four two-story dwellings and two one and one-half-story dwellings that ranged in size from 2,046 to 2,749

square feet of living area. The dwellings ranged in age from 17 to 28 years old. These properties were located from .16 to 1.81 miles from the subject property. Each comparable has a basement with four being partially finished, central air conditioning, one fireplace and a two-car or a three-car attached garage. The comparables had sites ranging in size from 10,500 to 35,943 square feet of land area. The sales occurred from October 2013 to April 2014 for prices ranging from \$167,439 to \$205,000 or from \$72.75 to \$87.00 per square foot of living area, including land. The appraiser made adjustments to the comparables for differences from the subject property to arrive at adjusted prices ranging from \$185,939 to \$209,700. Based on these sales the appraiser arrived at an estimated market value of \$195,000 or \$75.00 per square foot of living area, including land.

Based on this evidence the appellants requested the subject's assessment be reduced to \$65,000 to reflect the appraised value.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$80,000. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$240,096 or \$92.34 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the 2014 three year average median level of assessment for Madison County of 33.32% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales improved with two-story dwellings of frame and brick construction that ranged in size from 2,194 to 2,874 square feet of living area. The dwellings were constructed from 1993 to 2003. Each comparable has a basement with finished area, central air conditioning, one or two fireplaces and a garage ranging in size from 675 to 878 square feet of building area. Comparable #2 was described as being located in the subject's subdivision while the three remaining comparables were located from 2.3 to 2.56 miles from the subject property. The sales occurred from April 2014 to July 2014 for prices ranging from \$228,000 to \$325,000 or from \$97.84 to \$113.08 per square foot of living area, including land.

In rebuttal the board of review indicated that appellants' appraisal sale #1 was a "repo". The board of review requested confirmation of the assessment.

The appellants' original submission included a copy of the multiple listing service listing sheet for board of review sale #4 indicating the property had a "waterfront" frontage.

Conclusion of Law

The appellants contend 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 appellants did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The record contains an appraisal submitted by the appellants using six comparable sales and four comparable sales provided by the board of review. The comparables had varying degrees of

similarity to the subject property. These properties sold for prices ranging from \$167,439 to \$325,000 or from \$72.75 to \$113.08 per square foot of living area, including land. The two comparables most similar to the subject in location appear to be appellants' appraisal comparable sale #1 and board of review sale #2. These two properties sold for unit prices of \$87.00 and \$113.08 per square foot of living area, including land, respectively. Furthermore, board of review sale #2, with a unit price of \$113.08 per square foot of living area, is more similar to the subject dwelling in size than appellants' appraisal sale #1. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$92.34 per square foot of living area, including land, which is within the range established by the best comparable sales in the record. Based on this evidence the Board finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is not justified.

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



Member



Member



Member



Acting Member

DISSENTING: _____

CERTIFICATION

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 23, 2016



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.