



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

APPELLANT: Joshua Phelps
DOCKET NO.: 24-04838.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 08-19-165-020-000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Joshua Phelps, the appellant; and the Monroe 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 **Monroe** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$23,030
IMPR.: \$152,970
TOTAL: \$176,000

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Monroe County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2024 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 of masonry exterior construction with 2,314 square feet of living area.¹ The dwelling was constructed in 2014 and is 10 years old. Features of the home include a basement with finished area,² central air conditioning, a three-car garage with 924 square feet of building area and an inground swimming pool. The property has an approximately .77-acre site or 33,541 square foot site and is located in Waterloo, Monroe County.

¹ The Board finds the best description of the subject's dwelling size is found in the property information printout provided by the board of review, which contained a detailed sketch with dimensions of the improvements. The appellant's appraisal did not contain a sketch of the improvements.

² The appellant's appraiser disclosed the subject dwelling has basement finish, which was not refuted 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 estimating the subject property had a market value of \$447,000 as of January 1, 2024. The appraisal was prepared by Tina Radick, a certified residential real estate appraiser. The purpose of the appraisal was to determine the estimated market value for the subject property. The appraiser described the subject property to be in overall good condition.

In estimating the subject's market value, the appraiser developed the sales comparison approach to value utilizing three comparable sales that are located from 3.93 to 4.43 miles from the subject property. The comparables have sites ranging in size from .41 of an acre to 3.19 acres of land area. The photographic addendum depicts the comparables as one-story or two-story dwellings. The dwellings range in size from 1,900 to 2,766 square feet of living area and are from 8 to 18 years old. The comparables each have a basement with finished area, central air conditioning and a two-car or a three-car garage. One comparable has a pond/lake. Two comparables each have an inground swimming pool. The properties sold in March 2022 or June 2023 for prices ranging from \$415,000 to \$449,900 or from \$150.00 to \$236.78 per square foot of living area, including land. The appraiser applied adjustments to the comparables for differences when compared to the subject in site size, age, bathroom count, gross living area, garage capacity and inground swimming pool amenity to arrive at adjusted prices ranging from \$401,305 to \$444,995. Based on the adjusted sale prices, the appraiser estimated the subject had a market value of \$447,000 as of January 1, 2024.

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested an assessment reflective of the appraised value conclusion at the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$176,000. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$528,053 or \$228.20 per square foot of living area, including land, when using the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.³

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales with the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject and located from .4 of a mile to 2.6 miles from the subject property. The comparables have sites that range in size from 40,075 to 55,625 square feet or from approximately .92 of an acre to 1.28 acres of land area. The comparables are improved with one-story dwellings of masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 2,084 to 2,502 square feet of living area. The dwellings were built from 1996 to 2017. The comparables each have a basement, three of which have finished area. Each comparable has central air conditioning and a garage ranging in size from 768 to 1,094 square feet of building area. Three comparables each have a fireplace and two comparables each have an inground swimming pool. The properties sold from July 2022 to August 2024 for prices ranging from \$450,000 to \$675,000 or from \$185.45 to \$275.51 per

³ Procedural rule Sec. 1910.50(c)(1) provides that in all counties other than Cook, the three-year county wide assessment level as certified by the Department of Revenue will be considered. 86 Ill.Admin.Code Sec. 1910.50(c)(1). Prior to the drafting of this decision, the Department of Revenue has yet to publish figures for tax year 2024.

square foot of living area, including land. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

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 appellant submitted an appraisal of the subject property and the board of review submitted four comparable sales to support their respective positions before the Board. The Board has given less weight to the appellant's appraiser's conclusion of value as the appraiser chose three comparables which are located from 3.93 to 4.43 miles from the subject and differ substantially in dwelling size from the subject, when there were clearly other available comparables that were closer to the subject in location and more similar in dwelling size that were utilized by the board of review. Additionally, two of the comparables have 3 or more acre sites, when compared to the subject's .77-acre site. Lastly, the appraiser's comparable #2 is a dissimilar two-story dwelling when compared to the subject's one-story design and has a sale date that occurred 21 months prior to the lien date at issue and is thus less likely to be indicative of the subject's market value as of the January 1, 2024 assessment date. For these reasons, the Board finds the appraiser's conclusion of value lacks credibility to be a reliable indicator of value.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the board of review comparables #2 and #3, which sold more proximate in time to the assessment date at issue and are overall more similar to the subject in location, site size, dwelling size, design, age and some features. These two comparables sold in January and May 2023 for prices of \$510,000 and \$675,000 or for \$227.27 and \$275.51 per square foot of living area, including land, respectively. The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$528,053 or \$228.20 per square foot of living area, including land, which is bracketed by the two best comparable sales contained in the record both in terms of overall market value and on a price per square foot of living area basis, including land. Less weight was given to board of review comparable #1 due to its sale date occurring in 2022 less proximate to the lien date at issue than other sales in the record. Less weight was also given to board of review comparable #4 due to its considerably older dwelling age. Based on this record and after considering adjustments to the best comparables for differences when compared to the subject, the Board finds the subject's estimated market value as reflected by its assessment is supported and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not 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:

May 19, 2026



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

Joshua Phelps
403 Conrad Court
Waterloo, IL 62298

COUNTY

Monroe County Board of Review
Monroe County
100 South Main Street
Waterloo, IL 62298