



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

APPELLANT: Jonathan Kingsepp
DOCKET NO.: 22-02314.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 16-33-404-024

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Jonathan Kingsepp, the appellant, by attorney Marc D. Engel, of Rock Fusco & Connelly, LLC in Chicago; 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: \$64,132
IMPR.: \$229,095
TOTAL: \$293,227

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 2022 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 dwelling of brick and stone exterior construction with 4,102 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 2006 and is approximately 16 years old. Features of the home include a basement with finished area, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a 660 square foot 3-car garage. The property has an 11,960 square foot site and is located in Deerfield, West Deerfield 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 \$750,000 as of January 1, 2022. The appraisal was prepared by Scott Reicin, a Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser. The purpose of the appraisal was to estimate the market value of the subject property as of the effective date of the appraisal. The appraiser considered the subject property in average condition.

In estimating the market value of the subject property, the appraiser developed the sales comparison approach to value utilizing four comparable sales located from .25 of a mile to 1.60 miles from the subject property. The comparables have sites ranging in size from 9,375 to 19,166 square feet of land area and are improved with Traditional or Contemporary style, 2-story dwellings that range in size from 3,622 to 4,321 square feet of living area. The homes range in age from 17 to 57 years old. Three comparables have basements, two contain finished area. Each comparable has central air conditioning and a 2-car or a 3-car garage. Comparable #3 has an enclosed porch. The appraiser reported comparable #3 backs up to busy street and comparable #4 is located near train tracks. The comparables sold from February to November 2021 for prices ranging from \$660,000 to \$755,000 or from \$174.73 to \$190.99 per square foot of living area, including land. The appraiser adjusted comparables #1 and #4 for financing concessions. After considering other adjustments to the comparables for differences from the subject in location, site size, room count, gross living area, basement size, basement finished area, and/or features, the appraiser arrived at an estimated market value of \$750,000 as of January 1, 2022. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject property's total assessment to reflect the appraised value.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$293,227. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$881,621 or \$214.92 per square foot of living area, land included, when applying the 2022 3-year average median level of assessment of 33.26%.

In response to the appeal, the board of review critiqued the appellant's appraisal noting comparable #1 is the only sale from the subject's neighborhood, comparable #3 is nearly 1 mile from the subject and is much older than the subject with no adjustment for age, and comparable #4 exceeds 1.5 miles from the subject and has a negative location due to nearby train influence.

In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted information on five comparable sales located within .45 of a mile from the subject property. Board of review comparable #3 is the same sale as appraisal comparable #1. The comparables are situated on sites ranging in size from 11,560 to 13,940 square feet of land area and are improved with 2-story dwellings of brick or brick and wood siding exterior construction that range in size from 2,410 to 4,039 square feet of living area. The dwellings were built from 1963 to 1987 with effective ages from 1980 to 1997. Four comparables have basements with finished area and one comparable has a crawl space foundation. Each comparable has central air conditioning and a 2-car garage ranging in size from 462 to 576 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from November 2020 to August 2022 for prices ranging from \$660,000 to \$975,000 or from \$182.22 to \$278.01 per square foot of living area, including land. Board of review comparables #2, #3 and #4 are located in the subject's Briarwood subdivision and board of review comparables #1 and #5 are located in the adjacent Deer Run subdivision. The board of review submitted a map depicting the locations of the comparables in relation to the subject and a Multiple Listing Service sheet associated with each sale. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested that the subject property'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 submitted by the appellant and five comparable sales submitted by the board of review, one of which was included in the appellant's appraisal, to support their respective positions before the Board.

As to the appellant's appraisal, the Board finds the appraiser used a comparable home that is considerably older than the subject without any adjustment or explanation. In addition, the appraiser utilized one comparable that backs up to a busy street and one comparable that is located over 1.5 miles from the subject and is influenced by a nearby train when other sales more proximate to the subject without negative locational factors were available. For these reasons, the Board gives less weight to the appraiser's conclusion of value. The Board will look at the raw sales data.

The Board gives less weight to the parties' common comparable (appraisal comparable #1/board of review comparable #3) which lacks a basement foundation which is a feature of the subject. The Board gives less weight to appraisal comparables #3 and #4 due to their inferior locations when compared to the subject. The Board gives less weight to board of review comparables #1 and #2 which are considerably smaller than the subject dwelling in size. The Board gives less weight to board of review comparable #4 which sold in November 2020, less proximate in time to the January 1, 2022 assessment date than the other sales in the record.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be appellant's comparable #2 and board of review comparable #5 which are most similar to the subject in dwelling size and sold proximate in time to the assessment date at issue. However, both comparables are older dwellings than the subject suggesting upward adjustments are necessary to make them more equivalent to the subject. These properties sold in April 2021 and August 2022 for prices of \$739,500 and \$975,000 or \$180.06 and \$241.40 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$881,621 or \$214.92 per square foot of living area, including land, which is bracketed by the best comparable sales in the record. After considering adjustments to the best comparable sales for differences when compared to the subject, the Board finds the subject's estimated market value as reflected by the assessment is supported 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:

May 21, 2024



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

Jonathan Kingsepp, by attorney:
Marc D. Engel
Rock Fusco & Connelly, LLC
333 W. Wacker Drive
19th Floor
Chicago, IL 60606

COUNTY

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