



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

APPELLANT: Krista Sweetser
DOCKET NO.: 16-03383.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 16-29-418-002

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Krista Sweetser, 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: \$42,145
IMPR.: \$66,178
TOTAL: \$108,323

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 2016 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 2-story cape cod style dwelling of brick exterior construction with 1,594 square feet of living area.¹ The dwelling was constructed in 1950. Features of the home include a basement with finished area, a fireplace and one-car garage with 440 square feet of building area. The property has a 7,875 square foot site² and is located in Deerfield, West Deerfield Township, Lake County.

¹ The parties differ slightly as to the dwelling size of the subject. The Board finds the small discrepancy will not impact the Board's decision in this appeal.

² The appellant's appraisal reported a 9,229 square foot subject site and board of review's evidence indicated a 7,875 square foot site. The Board finds the best evidence of site size was the property record submitted by the board of review.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted an appraisal with an estimated market value of \$290,000 as of August 28, 2015. The appraisal report was prepared by Irene Aronov-Bekerman, a Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser. The property rights appraised were fee simple and the appraisal was prepared for a private mortgage insurance (PMI) release. In estimating the market value of the subject property, the appraiser developed the cost approach and the sales comparison approach to value. Under the cost approach the appraiser arrived at an estimated market value of \$353,100.

Under the sales comparison approach to value the appraiser used six comparables located within .35 of a mile from the subject property. The comparables are described as 1.5 or 2-story dwellings ranging in size from 1,151 to 1,765 square feet of living area that were 50 to 103 years old. Five comparables have a basement, with three having finished area; five comparables have central air conditioning; and each comparable has a one-car or a two-car garage. The comparables have sites ranging in size from 6,459 to 10,138 square feet of land area. Four comparables sold for prices ranging from \$263,000 to \$389,000 or from \$184.60 to \$228.50 per square foot of living area, including land. Two comparables had list prices of \$409,000 and \$380,000 or \$321.79 and \$215.30 per square feet of living area, including land, respectively. After the appraiser applied the adjustments to the comparables for differences from the subject, the comparables had adjusted prices ranging from \$284,265 to \$349,315. Under the sales comparison approach, the appraiser estimated the subject had a market value of \$290,000 as of August 28, 2015.

In reconciling the two approaches to value the appraiser considered the sales comparison approach as the best value indicator and arrived at an estimated market value of \$290,000 as of August 28, 2015. Based on this evidence the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$108,323. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$326,668 or \$204.94 per square foot of living area, land included, when using 1,594 square feet of living area and the 2016 three-year average median level of assessment for Lake County of 33.16% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on three comparable sales located within .25 of a mile of the subject property. The comparables are described as a 2-story and two, 1.75-story dwellings of brick exterior construction that range in size from 1,533 to 1,659 square feet of living area. The dwellings were constructed in either 1948 or 1949. Each comparable has a basement with one having finished area. Each comparable has a garage ranging in size from 323 to 485 square feet of living area; two comparables have central air conditioning; and one comparable has a fireplace. The comparables have sites with either 5,750 or 7,050 square feet of land area. The comparables sold from May 2014 to June 2016 for prices ranging from \$392,000 to \$515,000 or from \$255.71 to \$330.13 per square foot of living area, land included. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested that the assessment be confirmed.

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 record contains an appraisal presented by the appellant and three comparable sales submitted by the board of review.

As to the appraisal, the Board gave less weight to the conclusion of value contained in the appraisal because it was performed for a PMI release with an effective date of August 28, 2015 which limited the use of some 2016 sales supplied by the board of review that were more similar in size to the subject and located in the immediate subject neighborhood. In addition, one comparable sold in December 2014 which is less proximate in time and less likely to be reflective of market value as of the subject's January 1, 2016 assessment date. Therefore, these factors undermine the appraiser's final opinion of value. Therefore, the Board will look at the raw sales data in the appraisal.

The Board finds the parties submitted nine comparables for the Board's consideration. The Board gave less weight to appellant's appraisal comparables #5 and #6 because they were listings that have not yet sold. The Board also gave less weight to appellant's appraisal comparable #2 due to its considerably smaller dwelling size when compared to the subject. Lastly, reduced weight was given to the appellant's comparable #4 and board of review comparable #2 based on their 2014 sale dates that were less proximate in time to the subject's January 1, 2016 assessment date.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the appraisal comparable sales #1 and #3 along with board of review comparables #1 and #3. These four comparables are most similar to the subject in location, size, design, age and features. These properties sold from April 2015 to June 2016 for prices ranging from \$290,000 to \$515,000 or from \$184.60 to \$330.13 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$326,668 or \$204.94 per square foot of living area, land included which falls within the range as established by the best comparables in the record. After considering adjustments to the best comparables in the record, the Board finds the subject's estimated market value as reflected by its assessment is well supported. Therefore, no reduction in 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. Pursuant to Section 1910.50(d) of the rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(d)) 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

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: September 17, 2019



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

Krista Sweetser, by attorney:
Ronald Kingsley
Lake County Real Estate Tax Appeal, LLC
13975 W. Polo Trail Drive
#201
Lake Forest, IL 60045

COUNTY

Lake County Board of Review
Lake County Courthouse
18 North County Street, 7th Floor
Waukegan, IL 60085