



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

APPELLANT: Thomas & Patricia Mirocha  
DOCKET NO.: 15-05081.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 05-17-377-001

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Thomas & Patricia Mirocha, the appellants; and the McHenry 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 **McHenry** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

**LAND:** \$12,841  
**IMPR.:** \$67,073  
**TOTAL:** \$79,914

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**Statement of Jurisdiction**

The appellants timely filed the appeal from a decision of the McHenry 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 one-story dwelling of frame and brick exterior construction with 2,325 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 2004. Features of the home include a full basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a 726 square foot garage.<sup>1</sup> The property has a 43,498 square foot site and is located in Spring Grove, Burton Township, McHenry County.

The appellants contend both overvaluation and assessment inequity as the bases of the appeal. In support of these arguments the appellants submitted information on twelve comparable properties that were located from .3 of a mile to 3.3 miles from the subject property. The comparables were one-story, two-story or three-story dwellings that contained from 1,908 to

---

<sup>1</sup> The parties differ as to whether the subject's exterior has some brick facing, the number of bath fixtures and whether the subject's basement is finished or not. The Board finds these discrepancies will not impact the Board's decision in this appeal.

9,000 square feet of living area.<sup>2</sup> The comparables' features had varying degrees of similarity to the subject. Eleven of the comparables had lot sizes ranging from 43,545 to 334,976 square feet of land area. Nine of the comparables had recent sale dates occurring from April 2014 to March 2016 for prices ranging from \$144,901 to \$285,000 or from \$29.17 to \$116.47 per square foot of living area, including land. Eleven of the comparables had land assessments ranging from \$2,462 to \$35,312 and ten of the comparables had land assessments ranging from \$.08 to \$.29 per square foot of land area. Eleven comparables had improvement assessments ranging from \$35,454 to \$96,512 or from \$9.91 to \$33.07 per square foot of living area.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$79,914. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$240,054 or \$103.25 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the 2015 three-year average median level of assessment for McHenry County of 33.29% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue. The subject has a land assessment of \$12,841 or \$.30 per square foot of land area and an improvement assessment of \$67,073 or \$28.85 per square foot of living area.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on three comparable properties.<sup>3</sup> The proximity of the comparables to that of the subject's location was not revealed. The comparables were one-story dwellings containing from 1,906 to 2,361 square feet of living area. The comparables' features had varying degrees of similarity to the subject. The comparables had lot sizes ranging from 43,560 to 104,000 square feet of land area. The comparables had sale dates occurring from May to August 2015 for prices ranging from \$249,000 to \$321,000 or from \$130.64 to \$140.11 per square foot of living area, including land. The comparables had land assessments of \$12,841 and \$20,060 or from \$.19 to \$.29 per square foot of land area and improvement assessments ranging from \$59,805 to \$83,456 or from \$31.38 to \$35.35 per square foot of living area.

The board of review's evidence included a brief critiquing the appellants' submission.

### **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 parties submitted a total of twelve sales for the Board's consideration. The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the board of review's comparables #1 and #2. These comparables were most similar to the subject in lot size, age, size and/or features. These most

---

<sup>2</sup> The board of review revealed the size of the appellants' comparable #12 as 1,908 square foot of living area in their submission.

<sup>3</sup> The board of review's original submission reported 2016 assessment figures in their grid analysis for their comparables. The Property Tax Appeal Board subsequently obtained the 2015 assessments for the board of review's comparables.

similar comparables sold in May and June 2015 for prices of \$321,000 and \$320,000 or for \$135.96 and \$140.11 per square foot of living area including land, respectively. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$240,054 or \$103.25 per square foot of living area, including land, which is below the market values of the best comparable sales in this record. The Board gave less weight to the board of review's comparable #3 due to its considerably smaller size when compared to the subject. The Board gave less weight to the appellants' comparables. Comparable #1 is a dissimilar two-story dwelling and is considerably larger than the subject. Comparable #2 is a dissimilar two-story dwelling and is considerably larger than the subject. Comparable #3 is a dissimilar two-story dwelling and is significantly larger than the subject. Comparable #4 is a dissimilar two-story dwelling and is considerably larger than the subject. Comparable #5 has a lot size that is over 5 times larger than the subject's lot. Comparable #6 is a dissimilar one and one-half story dwelling and is significantly larger than the subject. Comparable #7 has a lot size that is over 5 times larger than the subject's lot and its dwelling is significantly older than the subject. Comparable #8 is a dissimilar two-story dwelling and is significantly older than the subject. Comparable #9 is a dissimilar two-story dwelling and is significantly larger than the subject. Comparable #10 has a lot size that is over 7 times larger than the subject's lot, is a dissimilar three-story dwelling, is significantly older and is over 3 times the size of the subject. In addition, the sale occurred greater than 14 months after the assessment date at issue. Comparable #11 has a lot size that is over 5 times larger than the subject's lot. Comparable #12 has a dwelling that is considerably smaller than the subject and is significantly older than the subject. Based on this evidence the Board finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is not justified on the grounds of overvaluation.

The taxpayers also contend assessment inequity as an alternative basis of the appeal. When unequal treatment in the assessment process is the basis of the appeal, the inequity of the assessments must be proved by clear and convincing evidence. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). Proof of unequal treatment in the assessment process should consist of documentation of the assessments for the assessment year in question of not less than three comparable properties showing the similarity, proximity and lack of distinguishing characteristics of the assessment comparables to the subject property. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(b). The Board finds the appellants did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.


The Board finds the best evidence of land assessment equity to be appellants' comparables #1, #2, #3, #4, #8 and #12, as well as board of review's comparables #1 and #3. These comparables were most similar to the subject in lot size. These most similar comparables had land assessments of \$12,301 and \$12,841. The subject's land assessment of \$12,841 is supported by the best land equity comparables in this record. Furthermore, seven of the most similar land comparables have identical land assessments as the subject. The Board gave less weight to the parties' remaining land comparables due to their larger lot sizes when compared to the subject's lot size. Based on this record the Board finds the appellants did not demonstrate with clear and convincing evidence that the subject's land was inequitably assessed and a reduction in the subject's land assessment is not justified on the grounds of uniformity.

The Board finds the best evidence of improvement assessment equity to be appellants' comparables #5 and #11, as well as the board of review's comparables #1 and #2. These comparables were most similar to the subject in style, size, age and features. These most similar

comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$44,532 to \$86,627 or from \$17.93 to \$35.35 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$67,073 or \$28.85 per square foot of living area falls within the range established by the best improvement equity comparables in this record. The Board gave less weight to the parties' remaining improvement comparables due to their dissimilarities when compared to the subject. Based on this record the Board finds the appellants did not demonstrate with clear and convincing evidence that the subject's improvement was inequitably assessed and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not justified on the grounds of uniformity.

The constitutional provision for uniformity of taxation and valuation does not require mathematical equality. A practical uniformity, rather than an absolute one, is the test. Apex Motor Fuel Co. v. Barrett, 20 Ill.2d 395 (1960). Although the comparables presented by the parties disclosed that the properties located in the same area are not assessed at identical levels, all that the constitution requires is a practical uniformity, which exists on the basis of the evidence.

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. Pursuant to Section 1910.50(b) of the rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(b)) the proceeding before the Property Tax Appeal Board is terminated when the decision is rendered. The Property Tax Appeal Board does not require any motion or request for reconsideration.



Chairman



Member



Acting Member



Member



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: February 20, 2018



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 or years of the same general assessment period, as provided in Sections 9-125 through 9-225, 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 such subsequent year or years 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 OR YEARS. A separate petition and evidence must be filed for each of the remaining years of the general assessment period.

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.

PARTIES OF RECORD

AGENCY

State of Illinois  
Property Tax Appeal Board  
William G. Stratton Building, Room 402  
401 South Spring Street  
Springfield, IL 62706-4001

APPELLANT

Thomas & Patricia Mirocha  
P.O. Box 142  
Spring Grove, IL 60081

COUNTY

McHenry County Board of Review  
McHenry County Government Center  
2200 N. Seminary Ave.  
Woodstock, IL 60098