



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

APPELLANT: Hong Wang
DOCKET NO.: 18-00264.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 10-05-403-009

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: \$13,469
IMPR.: \$48,020
TOTAL: \$61,489

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 traditional style dwelling of vinyl siding exterior construction with 2,800¹ square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 2004. Features of the home include an unfinished basement, central air conditioning and a 504 square foot two-car garage. The property has a 10,402 square foot site and is located in Round Lake, Fremont 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 \$166,000

¹ The appellant's appraiser reported a dwelling size of 2,788 square feet of living area and a site size of 10,398 square feet of land area. The assessing officials reported a dwelling size of 2,800 square feet of living area and a site size of 10,402 square feet of land area. The Board finds assessing officials submitted a more detailed property sketch than the appraiser. The Board finds that the slight size differences are insignificant to determining the correct assessment of the subject property based on the evidence in the record.

as of July 22, 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; however, the effective date, report date and inspection date were identified as July 22, 2018. The subject property was identified as owner occupied. In the Description of Improvements section of the appraisal, the appraiser described the condition of the subject to be in fair to average condition with no required repairs. In the Photograph Addendum the appraiser documents areas of the basement and exterior of the subject as having deferred maintenance and asserts in his General Text Addendum that the subject has a "significant amount of deferred maintenance." The appraiser assigned a below average condition rating to the subject property. 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 arriving at an opinion of market value, the appraiser utilized four comparable sales located within 0.23 of a mile from the subject property. The appraiser noted in his general text addendum that the search for comparables focused on locations proximate to the subject that were in fair to average condition. Each of the comparables was assigned an average condition rating. Three of the comparables are short sales and one comparable is a foreclosed property. The comparables have sites that range in size from 8,685² to 14,035 square feet of land area that are improved with two-story traditional style dwellings of average quality construction that range in size from 2,016 to 4,074 square feet of living area. The homes are each 14 years old have unfinished basements, central air conditioning and a two-car garage. The comparables sold from April 2017 to March 2018 for prices ranging from \$192,000 to \$230,000 or from \$55.84 to \$102.18 per square foot of living area, land included. The appraiser adjusted the comparables for terms of sale, site size, location, condition, dwelling size, bathroom count and functional utility. This resulted in adjusted prices of the comparables ranging from \$165,560 to \$187,389. 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 \$166,000 indicating that most weight was given to comparable sale #1.

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested the subject's assessment be reduced to \$55,328 which equates to a market value of \$166,001 or \$59.29 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 \$61,489. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$185,880 or \$66.39 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 addressing the appraisal report and provided copies of the Multiple Listing Service (MLS) sheets for each of the appraisal comparables. They argued

² The appraiser's comparable #2 had a site size reported in the grid of approximately 10,000 square feet of land area. The board of review reported that the actual site size of this comparable to be 8,685 square feet of land area.

that the effective date of the appraisal was seven months after the assessment date in question. With respect to the comparable sales included in the report, they state that two have significantly different dwelling sizes compared to the subject, that two are adjusted for a pond but not for backing to a proposed commercial development. The board of review provided a correct site size for appraisal comparable #2 and questioned the appraiser's inconsistent application of site adjustments. The board of review questioned the appraiser's application of a \$15,000 functional utility adjustment, as the appraisal comparables sold "as is". The board of review questioned how the across the board REO/short sale adjustment was determined and noted that three of the comparables had fireplaces that were excluded from the appraisal report. Lastly, the board of review argued that the subject's current market value based on the assessment is below the range of unadjusted sale prices of comparables. The board of review questioned the credibility of the appraisal given the number of errors and omissions.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted a grid analysis, property detail sheets, property record cards and Multiple Listing Service (MLS) sheets on the subject and six comparables located within approximately 0.90 of a mile from the subject property. The comparables have sites that range in size from 10,454 to 14,994 square feet of land area and are improved with two-story dwellings of vinyl siding exterior construction that range in size from 2,760 to 2,998 square feet of living area. The homes were built in 2004 or 2005. Each comparable has a basement, two with finished area, central air conditioning, one fireplace and a garage ranging in size from 504 to 704 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from August 2016 to March 2018 for prices ranging from \$245,000 to \$292,000 or from \$81.72 to \$97.40 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 parties submitted an appraisal and six comparable sales for the Board's consideration. The Board gave less weight to the appraiser's opinion of value for the subject property due to a series of errors and omissions throughout the report which call into question the credibility of the report which include conflicting statements with respect to the subject's condition, differences in the subject's dwelling and site size compared to board of review information, incorrect site size for the appraisal comparable #2 and an inconsistent application of site adjustments. The Board will, however, consider the raw comparable sales data contained in the appraisal report.

The Board gave less weight to the board of review comparables which, based on information contained in the MLS sheets, describe each of these properties as having a superior condition when compared to the subject. The board of review property record card for the subject contains notes indicating the subject has extensive mold damage in the basement and that a one year

reduction for this situation was given in August 2017. The appraiser's photographs suggest that this condition had not been mitigated as of the July 2018 inspection date.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the appraisal comparables #2 and #3 which are more similar to the subject in terms of location, age, design, dwelling size and features. These two comparables sold in November 2017 and March 2018 for prices of \$192,000 and \$230,000 or for \$68.23 and \$80.81 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$185,880 or \$66.39 per square foot of living area, including land, which is below the sale prices and price per square foot of the two best comparable sales in the record and appears supported based on its condition. The Board gave less weight to the appraisal comparables #1 and #4 which have significantly different dwelling sizes when compared to the subject. After considering adjustments to the comparables for differences with the subject, the Board finds a preponderance of evidence supports the subject's assessment and 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.



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: November 17, 2020



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

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