



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

APPELLANT: Cheryl Steiger and David Weber
DOCKET NO.: 14-02295.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 06-20-406-018

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Cheryl Steiger and David Weber, the appellants; and the Lake 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 **Lake** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$ 5,079
IMPR.: \$14,252
TOTAL: \$19,331

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellants 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 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 consists of a one and one-half story dwelling of vinyl siding exterior construction that has 1,231 square feet of living area. The dwelling was built in 1949. The home features central air conditioning. The subject has a 6,098 square foot channel front site with lake access. The subject property is located in Avon Township, Lake County, Illinois.

The appellants argued the subject property was overvalued. In support of this claim, the appellants submitted information on five comparable sales located from .19 to 1.13 miles from the subject property. The comparables consist of one and one-half story dwellings of unknown exterior construction that were built from 1945 to 1955. Features had varying degrees of similarity when compared to the subject. The dwellings range in size from 1,237 to 1,285 square feet of living area. Their land sizes were not disclosed. The comparables sold from June 2013 to December 2013 for prices ranging from \$25,000 to \$46,500 or from \$19.62 to \$36.19 per square foot of living area including land. The appellants applied adjustments to the comparables for

differences when compared to the subject in arriving at an opinion of market value for the subject property of \$31,836. Based on this evidence, the appellants requested a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the subject's final assessment of \$19,331. The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$58,016 or \$47.13 per square foot of living area including land when applying Lake County's 2014 three-year average median level of assessment of 33.32%.

In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted a letter addressing the appeal and information on four comparable sales located within .79 of a mile from the subject property. The comparables consist of one-story, one and one-half story or split-level dwellings of vinyl siding exterior construction that were built from 1946 to 1974. Features had varying degrees of similarity when compared to the subject. The dwellings range in size from 912 to 1,523 square feet of living area and are situated on channel sites with lake access that range in size from 5,000 to 10,019 square feet of land area. The comparables sold from May 2013 to August 2014 for prices ranging from \$47,000 to \$72,000 or from \$46.16 to \$66.36 per square foot of living area including land.

With respect to the appellants' evidence, the board of review argued all the comparable sales were investor, foreclosure, short sales, or sheriff sales. In addition, the comparables are situated on typical interior non-channel front sites. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

Under rebuttal, the appellants submitted a side-by-side analysis of both parties' comparables with adjustments for differences when compared to the subject. The appellants applied different adjustments amounts to its comparables than that were originally submitted to the Board. Based on this evidence, the appellants calculated a revised opinion of market value for the subject property of \$41,026.

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 no reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The record contains nine comparable sales for the Board's consideration. The Board gave less weight to the comparables submitted by the appellants. These comparables are located on typical interior non-channel sites, whereas the subject is situated on channel site with lake access. Additionally, comparable #4 is located over one mile from the subject property. Finally, the appellants failed to provide the comparables land sizes or exterior construction for comparison to the subject, which further detracts from the weight of the evidence. The Board gave less weight to comparable #4 submitted by the board of review due to its dissimilar design, newer age and superior features when compared to the subject. The Board finds comparable sales #1, #2 and #3

submitted by the board of review are most similar when compared to the subject in location, setting, land area, design, age, dwelling size and features. These comparables sold from August 2013 to August 2014 for prices ranging from \$47,000 to \$72,000 or from \$46.16 to \$66.36 per square foot of living area including land. The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$58,016 or \$47.13 per square foot of living area including land, which falls within the range established by the most similar comparable sales contained in the record. After considering logical adjustments to the comparables for any differences when compared to the subject, the Board finds the subject's estimated market value as reflected by its assessment is supported. 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



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.