



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

APPELLANT: Adam Peterson  
DOCKET NO.: 19-02623.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 03-10-401-009

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Adam Peterson, the appellant, and the Winnebago 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 **Winnebago** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

**LAND:** \$32,598  
**IMPR.:** \$60,474  
**TOTAL:** \$93,072

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**Statement of Jurisdiction**

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Winnebago County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2019 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 containing 2,579 square feet of living area with cement board siding, a metal roof, and triple pane windows. Additional features include a full basement, central air conditioning, one fireplace, geothermal heating, and a three-car attached garage. The dwelling was completed in 2019. The property has an 8.67 acre site and is located in Rockton, Rockton Township, Winnebago 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 \$370,000 as of November 12, 2018. The appraisal was prepared by Courtney R. Prentice, a certified general real estate appraiser. The client was identified as Northwest Bank and the assignment type was designated as a refinance transaction. The appraiser indicated within the report the subject dwelling is new construction, beginning in 2018. The appraiser stated in the report, "The owner acted as the self-general and just completed construction on the house. The appraisal is

for the end loan.” The appraiser also indicated the owner estimated the cost to build the house was about \$310,000, which excludes the price paid for the land of almost \$80,000. The appraiser developed both the cost approach to value and the sales comparison approach to value in arriving at the estimated market value.

With respect to the cost approach the appraiser stated this method reflects the cost of the subject as built by a contractor. The appraiser stated that the owner acted as the general contractor and did much of the work himself. The appraiser estimated the site value to be \$80,000. Replacement cost new was estimated to be \$382,915 using the Marshall & Swift cost schedules. As the dwelling was new, no depreciation was deducted. To the land value and the depreciated improvement value the appraiser added \$15,000 for the site improvements to arrive at an estimated value under the cost approach of \$477,915.

Under the sales comparison approach to value the appraiser used four comparable sales improved with one-story dwellings ranging in size from 2,000 to 3,062 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 5 to 50 years old. Each home has a basement with three having finished area, central air conditioning, and a two-car or a three-car attached garage. Comparable #1 has a small horse barn and comparable #3 has an additional two-car detached garage. The comparables have sites ranging in size from 13,400 square feet of land area to 15 acres and are located from .32 to 14.44 miles from the subject property. The sales occurred from May 2018 to October 2018 for prices ranging from \$340,000 to \$370,000 or from \$120.84 to \$177.50 per square foot of living area, including land. Adjustments were made to the comparables for differences from the subject to arrive at adjusted prices ranging from \$344,160 to \$391,680. The appraiser arrived at an estimated value under the sales comparison approach to value of \$370,000.

In reconciling the two approaches to value, the appraiser contends the cost approach is not recognized as the basis for pricing in the subject’s market area, is often skewed high from the cost service, is not viewed as credible and has no influence. The appraiser explained the sales comparison approach had adequate data and the final value opinion was selected from the upper range based on the subject being new construction. The appraiser estimated the subject property had a market value of \$370,000 as of November 12, 2018.

Included with the appellant’s submission was a copy of the final decision from the Winnebago County Board of Review. The decision disclosed the assessment was prorated based on a date of occupancy of October 31, 2019, and a market value of \$386,721. The subject had an equalized (full) improvement assessment of \$96,309 as occupied and a prorated improvement assessment for the 2019 tax year of \$60,474. The notice disclosed the subject improvement had a partial assessment as of January 1, 2019 of \$53,141. The improvement had a prorated assessment from the date of occupancy to the end of the year of \$7,333, which when added to the partial assessment resulted in the improvement assessment of \$60,474. The appellant’s petition indicates the subject’s prorated assessment should be calculated from a market value of \$370,000 based on the appraisal, which would result in a revised prorated total assessment of \$92,130.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total prorated assessment for the subject of \$93,072, which was based on a market value of \$386,721

or \$149.95 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject property has a land assessment of \$32,598 and a pro-rated improvement assessment of \$60,474.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on two comparable sales identified by the township assessor improved with one-story dwellings of frame or masonry and frame construction that have either 2,222 or 2,806 square feet of living area. The dwellings were built in 1976 and 1994. Each home has a full basement that is partially finished, central air conditioning, one fireplace and an attached two-car or three-car garage with 552 or 758 square feet of building area. Comparable #1 has two pole barns with 960 and 720 square feet of building area, respectively. Comparable #2 has a detached garage with 1,776 square feet of building area as well as two pole buildings with 324 and 1,280 square feet of building area, respectively. Comparable #1 has a 4.83-acre site and comparable #2 has a 10-acre site and both are located in rural Rockton. These properties sold in July 2018 and September 2018 each for a price of \$370,000 or \$131.86 and \$166.52 per square foot of living area, including land. Assessor comparable sale #1 is the same property as appraisal comparable sale #1 although the parties disagree as to the size of the dwelling. The board of review requested the subject's 2019 instant assessment totaling \$93,072 be sustained.

The appellant submitted rebuttal comments from attorney Trent M. Ferguson critiquing the evidence and requesting the subject's assessment be reduced to reflect the appraised value.

### **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.

Initially, the Board finds the appellant is not complaining about the fact the subject property has a prorated assessment with a partial improvement assessment as of January 1 of \$53,141, a land assessment of \$32,598, and an occupancy date of October 31, 2019. The appellant is arguing that the subject's prorated assessment should be calculated using the appraised value of \$370,000. The notice of final decision from the board of review disclosed the prorated assessment was based on a market value of \$386,721. Therefore, the issue before this Board is what was the market value of the subject property after completion of the home and on the occupancy date.

The Board finds the appellant's appraisal contains a cost approach to value, which should be given some consideration as the subject dwelling is new construction and had no forms of depreciation. The estimated value under the cost approach was \$477,915, which is greater than the market value used by the board of review to calculate the prorated assessment. Additionally, the appraiser reported the land cost \$80,000 and the appellant estimated the cost to build the house was only at about \$310,000, which total \$390,000. This total is practically equivalent to the market value used by the board of review to calculate the prorated assessment, and it should

be understood that the total excludes any consideration for the appellant's own work as the general contractor during construction.

The record also has four comparable sales used by the appellant's appraiser and two sales provided by the board of review, one of which was a common sale. Each comparable is improved with a home that is older than the subject dwelling, which should require upward adjustments to make the comparables more equivalent to the subject property. Nevertheless, the comparables sold for prices ranging from \$340,000 to \$370,000 or from \$128.84 to \$177.50 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's full value used to calculate the prorated assessment was \$386,721 or \$149.95 per square foot of living area, including land, which is within the range of these sales on a square foot basis.

The Board finds the subject's assessment is supported by the cost approach to value and the comparable sales provided by the parties. Based on this evidence the Board finds the assessment of the subject property as established by the board of review is correct 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: July 20, 2021



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

Adam Peterson  
3394 Yale Bridge Road  
Rockton, IL 61072

COUNTY

Winnebago County Board of Review  
Winnebago County Admin. Bldg.  
404 Elm Street  
Rockford, IL 61101