

# FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Hong Wang

DOCKET NO.: 18-00263.001-R-1 PARCEL NO.: 07-10-306-028

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Hong Wang, the appellant; 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:** \$18,405 **IMPR.:** \$79,991 **TOTAL:** \$98,396

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 2018 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 two-story dwelling of wood siding exterior construction with 2,522<sup>1</sup> square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1987. Features of the home include a finished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a 490 square foot two-car garage. The property has a 15,969 square foot site and is located in Gurnee, Warren Township, Lake County.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted an appraisal estimating the subject property had a market value of \$254,000

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The appellant's appraiser reported a dwelling size of 2,522 square feet of living area while assessing officials reported a dwelling size of 2,636 square feet of living area. Both parties submitted a sketch of the subject improvements. The appraiser's sketch is more detailed, showing a two-story foyer excluded in the board of review sketch. The Board finds the slight size difference is not relevant to determining the correct assessment of the subject property based on the evidence in the record.

as of January 1, 2018. The appraisal was prepared by Raymond A. Anderson, a certified residential real estate appraiser.

The purpose of the appraisal was to determine the market value of the subject property for a tax appeal. The appraised value was identified as retrospective and the subject was identified as tenant occupied. The subject's actual age was reported as 31 years with an effective age of 15 years. An effective age that is lower than the actual age of a property, suggests a better than average condition for the age of the property. The appraiser described the subject in "below average condition with no required repairs" and assigned a condition rating of below average in the grid analysis. The appraiser provided no commentary or photographic evidence supporting the below average condition rating. In estimating the market value of the subject property, the appraiser developed the comparable sales approach to value and noted that the income approach was considered, but not developed, due to a lack of reliable market rental data.

In support of the subject's opinion of market value, the appraiser utilized six comparable sales located within 0.51 of a mile from the subject property and where five of the comparables were located in a subdivision different from the subject. The appraiser stated that his search for comparables focused on sales in the subject's neighborhood which were in fair to average condition. Condition ratings of the comparables, as shown in the comparable grid, are superior, good or below average. The comparables have sites that range in size from 9,000 to 26,500 square feet of land area and are improved with two-story traditional dwellings of average quality construction that range in size from 1,872 to 2,636 square feet of living area. The homes range in age from 27 to 30 years. Each comparable has a basement, five with finished area,<sup>2</sup> central air conditioning, one fireplace and a two-car garage. The comparables sold from March to December 2017 for prices ranging from \$238,500 to \$305,000 or from \$115.19 to \$127.40 per square foot of living area, land included. The appraiser adjusted the comparables for concessions, location, site size, property condition, bath count, dwelling size, basement finishes and fireplace. These adjustments resulted in adjusted prices ranging from \$253,139 to \$274,933. After his analysis of all pertinent facts related to the subject and comparable sales, the appraiser arrived at an opinion of market value for the subject of \$254,000.

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested the subject's assessment be reduced to \$84,658 which equates to a market value of \$253,999 or \$100.71 per square foot of living area, land included when applying the statutory assessment level of 33.33%.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$98,396. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$297,449 or \$117.94 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the 2018 three year average median level of assessment for Lake County of 33.08% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

The board of review submitted comments, a grid analysis and Multiple Listing Service (MLS) sheets related to the appraisal comparables. They questioned the appraiser's condition adjustments to five of the six comparables and noted that it was unclear how these adjustments

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The Multiple Listing Service sheet submitted by the board of review for appraisal comparable #4 depicts the property as having an unfinished basement.

were developed or substantiated. The board of review noted that appraisal comparables #1 and #2 were located on the subdivision feeder street but that no adjustment was made for a negative traffic influence. They argued that the per square foot adjustment of \$30.00 used by the appraiser was too low compared to sale prices ranging from \$115 to \$140 per square foot. The MLS sheet for appraisal comparable #4 describes the property as having an unfinished basement, however, the appraiser reports the property to have a finished basement. The board of review argues this comparable sale is incorrectly adjusted.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales located within approximately 0.32 of a mile from the subject property and where all of the comparables are located in the subject's Pembrook subdivision. Board of review comparable #1 is the same property as the appraisal comparable #1. The comparables have sites that range in size from 9,000 to 26,500 square feet of land area and are improved with two-story dwellings of wood siding exterior construction that range in size from 2,226 to 2,383 square feet of living area. The homes were built in 1987 or 1989. Each comparable has a basement, three with finished area, central air conditioning, one fireplace and a garage ranging in size from 420 to 658 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from November 2016 to September 2017 for prices ranging from \$274,500 to \$311,000 or from \$115.19 to \$139.71 per square foot of living area, land included. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested the subject's 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 and four comparable sales for the Board's consideration where one comparable used by the board of review was also used by the appraiser. The Board gave less weight to the opinion of value contained in the appraisal report as the below average condition rating of the subject was not supported with commentary or photographic evidence. The comparables selected by the appraiser, having mostly superior condition and located outside the subject's immediate subdivision, do not appear to be the best available sales. The board of review provided three additional sales within the subject's subdivision. Additionally, discrepancies in the appraiser's treatment of effective age and the incorrect adjustment of unfinished basement for his comparable #4 leads the Board to question the credibility of the final opinion of value.

The Board gave less weight to the board of review comparable #4 which has an unfinished basement dissimilar to the subject's finished basement. The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the board of review comparables #1, #2 and #3 which are more similar to the subject in terms of location, age, design, dwelling size and features. These board of review comparables sold from November 2016 to September 2017 for prices ranging from \$274,500 to \$284,000 or from \$115.19 to \$126.00 per square foot of living area, including land. The

subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$297,449 or \$117.94 per square foot of living area, including land, which falls above the sale prices and within the price per square foot range established by the best comparable sales in the record. The subject's slightly larger dwelling and site size supports a slightly higher overall value than the range established by the best comparable sales. After considering adjustments to the comparables for differences with the subject, 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. 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.

2	1. Fen
	Chairman
C. R.	asort Stoffen
Member	Member
Dan Dikini	Sarah Schley
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:	November 17, 2020
	Middl 214
	Clark of the Property Town Asset Property

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 <u>PETITION AND EVIDENCE</u> 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**

Hong Wang 1608 Jessica Lane Libertyville , IL 60048

## **COUNTY**

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