



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

APPELLANT: Adam Dziekonski  
DOCKET NO.: 13-01117.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 10-23-302-019

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Adam Dziekonski, the appellant, by attorney Andrew J. Rukavina of The Tax Appeal Company, in Mundelein; and the Lake County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds a reduction 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:** \$19,718  
**IMPR.:** \$67,077  
**TOTAL:** \$86,795

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 2013 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 frame dwelling with 2,528 square feet of living area that was built in 1994. Features include a finished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a 420 square foot attached garage. The subject

property has a 11,248 square foot site. The subject property is located in Freemont Township, Lake County, Illinois.

The appellant submitted evidence before the Property Tax Appeal Board claiming overvaluation as the basis to the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted an appraisal of the subject property estimating a market value of \$245,000 as of January 1, 2013. The appraiser developed the sales comparison approach to value in arriving at the final opinion of value. The appraiser identified three suggested comparable sales that had varying degrees of similarity when compared to the subject. The comparables are located in close proximity to the subject. The comparables sold in May or August of 2012 for prices ranging from \$205,000 to \$258,000 or from \$92.59 to \$105.19 per square foot of living area including land. After adjusting the comparables for differences to the subject, the appraiser concluded the subject property had a market value of \$245,000 or \$96.91 per square foot of living area including land. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested the subject's assessment be reduced to reflect the appraised value.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject property's final assessment of \$95,633 was disclosed. The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$287,705 or \$113.81 per square foot of living area including land when applying Lake County's 2013 three-year average median level of assessment of 33.24%. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(c)(1).

In response to the appeal, the board of review argued appraisal comparables #1 and #3 are located in a different development (Tullamore) whereas the subject is located in the Cambridge subdivision. Comparable #2 is located adjacent to a proposed 30-acre retail development.

In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted four suggested comparable sales located from .386 of a mile to 1.596 miles from subject. All the comparables are located within the subject's Cambridge subdivision. The comparables had varying degrees of similarity when compared to the subject. They sold from June 2012 to September 2013 for prices ranging from \$264,500 to \$299,900 or from \$100.19 to \$131.99 per 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 met this burden of proof.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value contained in this record is comparable sale #2 contained in the appellant's appraisal and comparables #2 and #3 submitted by the board of review. These comparables are located in close proximity and were similar to the subject in land area, design, age, size and most features. They sold from August 2012 to September 2013 for prices ranging from \$258,000 to \$277,500 or from \$96.27 to \$104.40 per square foot of living area including land. The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$287,705 or \$113.81 per square foot of living area including land, which falls above the range established by the most similar comparable sales contained in the record. Therefore, a reduction in the subject's assessment is justified.

The Board gave less weight to the appraisal submitted by the appellant. Comparables #1 and #3 are considerably older in age than the subject. In this context, the Board finds it problematic the appellant's appraiser made a minimal adjustment to comparable due to its older age when compared to the subject, but did not apply any adjustment to comparable #3 for its older age. The Board finds the large condition adjustment amount applied to comparable #3 is not supported by any credible market value evidence. These factors undermine the credibility of the final value conclusion as determined by the appellant's appraiser. The Board also gave less weight to comparable #1 submitted by the board of review due to its distant location and superior pond view when compared to the subject. Additionally, comparable #4 is smaller in dwelling size when compared to the subject.

In conclusion, the Board finds the appellant has demonstrated the subject property was overvalued by a preponderance of the evidence. Therefore, a reduction in the subject's assessment is 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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

*K. L. Fan*

*Klaus Albrecht*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member

*JR*

*Jerry White*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Acting Member

*Robert Steffen*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Acting Member

DISSENTING: \_\_\_\_\_

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

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 20, 2015

*A. Proctor*

\_\_\_\_\_  
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 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 the subsequent year 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.

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.