



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

APPELLANT: Cinthia Estrada
DOCKET NO.: 15-02676.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 08-16-313-018

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Cinthia Estrada, the appellant, by attorney Ronald Kingsley, of Lake County Real Estate Tax Appeal, LLC in Lake Forest; 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: \$7,176
IMPR.: \$19,105
TOTAL: \$26,281

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 2015 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 1½-story dwelling of brick construction with 1,248 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1945. Features of the dwelling include an unfinished basement and a 300 square foot garage. The property has a 10,201 square foot site and is located in Waukegan, Waukegan Township, Lake County.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted information on five comparable sales. Comparable #1 and #6 are the same property. These comparables are described as 1 or 2-story dwellings of brick or frame construction built between 1915 and 1939. They range in size from 1,160 to 1,257 square feet of living area. They feature unfinished basements, two have central air conditioning, one has a fireplace and four have garages. They are located a distance of .22 to .48 of a mile from the subject. These comparables sold between January 2014 and April 2015 for prices ranging from

\$33,000 to \$76,000 or from \$27.78 to \$60.46 per square foot of living area land included. The appellant requested the total assessment be reduced to \$17,470 or a market value of approximately \$52,415 or \$42.00 per square foot of living area including land at the statutory level of assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$26,281. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$79,207 or \$63.47 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the 2015 three-year average median level of assessment for Lake County of 33.18% 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. They are described as 1½-story dwellings of brick or frame construction built between 1940 and 1953. They range in size from 1,270 to 1,435 square feet of living area. All of the comparables feature unfinished basements and garages. Three have central air conditioning and two have fireplaces. They are located a distance of .04 to .90 of a mile from the subject. These comparables sold between December 2013 and August 2015 for prices ranging from \$89,900 to \$112,900 or from \$65.05 to \$80.71 per square foot of living area land included.

Based on this evidence and argument, 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 and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The Board gave less weight to the appellant's comparables based on the dissimilar age of the dwelling, style of the dwelling, and/or site size as compared to the subject. The Board also gave less weight to the board of review comparable #3 based on its somewhat dated 2013 sale which was not as proximate in time to the subject's January 1, 2015 assessment date as other comparables. The Board finds the best evidence of market value in the record to be board of review comparables #1, #2 and #4. These comparables were most similar to the subject in location, site size, dwelling size, style and age and sold proximate in time to the subject's assessment date of January 1, 2015. These comparables sold for prices ranging from \$95,000 to \$112,900 or from \$67.19 to \$80.71 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$79,207 or \$63.47 per square foot of living area, including land, which is below the best comparable sales in this record on both a total market value basis as well as a per square foot basis. Based on this evidence the Board finds a reduction in the subject's assessment based on overvaluation is not justified.

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.