



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

APPELLANT: Timothy & Lisa Haseman  
DOCKET NO.: 08-02922.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 13-15-176-011

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Timothy & Lisa Haseman, the appellants, and the DeKalb 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 DeKalb County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

**LAND:** \$9,684  
**IMPR.:** \$49,091  
**TOTAL:** \$58,775

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property consists of 15,700 square feet of land area located in Shabbona, DeKalb County. The property is improved with a two-story single-family frame constructed dwelling that was built in 1940, but has an effective age of 1987. The home contains 1,900 square feet of living area and features a full unfinished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace, and a detached six-car garage. The property also features a 24' above-ground swimming pool.

The appellants contend that the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in the property's assessed valuation as the basis of this appeal. In support of the market value argument, the appellants submitted two separate appraisals.

The appraisal prepared by Stephanie Englehart, a State Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser, employed by Appraisals, Ltd. in Sandwich appraised the fee simple property rights of the subject property for a refinance transaction wherein the client was Waterman State Bank. The appraiser used two of the three traditional approaches to value in concluding an estimated market value of \$176,500 for the subject property as of July 17, 2008.

In describing the improvements, the appraiser noted the property enjoys granite countertops in the kitchen, oak kitchen cabinets and oak six panel doors.

Under the cost approach, the appraiser estimated the subject's land value at \$50,000. Using the Marshall & Swift Residential Cost Handbook, the appraiser determined a replacement cost new for the subject dwelling including the basement, fireplace, deck, above ground pool and garage of \$191,012. Physical depreciation of \$50,943 was calculated resulting in a depreciated value of improvements of \$140,069. Next, a value for site improvements of \$3,500 was added. Thus, under the cost approach, the appraiser estimated a market value of \$193,569 for the subject.

In the report, the appraiser reported that assessing officials report only five sales of residential properties in Shabbona in 2008 so the appraiser expanded the search for sales about five miles to the east. Under the sales comparison approach, the appraiser used three sales comparables located between 5.14 and 5.50-miles from the subject property in Waterman, Illinois. The comparables were said to be on the market from 5 to 257 days prior to sale.

The subject and comparables were described in story-height as 'traditional.' Due to the nature of the photographs, a determination of exact story height cannot be made, but at least two of the homes appear to be one and one-half-story dwellings. Similarly, for quality of construction, the appraiser has described the properties as 'average/good.' The dwellings range in age from 58 to 70 years old with apparent effective ages of 20 years. The comparables range in size from 1,650 to 1,850 square feet of living area. Each of the comparables has a full basement, one of which was partially finished. Additional features included central air conditioning and a 1-car or 2-car garage. The sales occurred between June and July 2008 for prices ranging from \$152,000 to \$177,000 or from \$92.12 to \$95.68 per square foot of living area including land.

In comparing the comparable properties to the subject, the appraiser made adjustments for room count, dwelling size, basement finish, and garage stalls. The analysis resulted in adjusted sales prices for the comparables ranging from \$167,758 to \$185,267 or from \$100.14 to \$100.89 per square foot of living area including land. From this process, the appraiser estimated a value for the subject by the sales comparison approach of \$176,500 or \$92.89 per square foot of living area including land.

Without further explanation in the final reconciliation, the appraiser concluded an estimate of value of \$176,500 for the subject property.

The second appraisal prepared by G. Roger Jacobson, a State Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser, employed by Jacobson and Associates, Ltd. in Rochelle appraised the fee simple

property rights of the subject property for a refinance transaction wherein the client was also Waterman State Bank. The appraiser again used two of the three traditional approaches to value in concluding an estimated market value of \$175,000 for the subject property as of May 11, 2006.

In describing the improvements, the appraiser noted the garage has 144 square feet of office space finished with drywall and carpet and the kitchen has newer cabinets. The appraiser indicated the subject dwelling does not have a fireplace. Detriments included that four windows upstairs needed trim and while functional obsolescence was not observed, the appraiser stated "small town location has created external obsolescence."

Under the cost approach, the appraiser estimated the subject's land value at \$35,000. Using the Marshall & Swift Cost Manual, the appraiser determined a replacement cost new for the subject dwelling including the basement, deck and garage of \$225,300. Physical depreciation of \$65,000 along with external obsolescence of \$11,000 were calculated resulting in a depreciated value of improvements of \$149,300. Next, a value for site improvements of \$3,000 was added. Thus, under the cost approach, the appraiser estimated a market value of \$187,300 for the subject.

In the report, the appraiser reported that there were 19 sales of residential properties in Shabbona in 2005 for an average price of \$158,450 and an average marketing time of 145 days. For 2006, there were 3 sales in Shabbona with an average price of \$152,466 and an average marketing time of 114 days. Under the sales comparison approach, the appraiser used five sales comparables located between .02 and .55-miles from the subject property in Shabbona. The comparables were said to be on the market from 51 to 396 days prior to sale.

The comparables were described in story-height as a one and one-half-story and four, two-story dwellings of frame or brick and frame construction. The dwellings range in age from 65 to 100+ years old. The comparables range in size from 1,200 to 2,416 square feet of living area. Each of the comparables has a full or partial unfinished basement, central air conditioning and a 1-car, 2-car or 3-car garage with one comparable also having a shed. The sales occurred between June 2005 and January 2006 for prices ranging from \$152,450 to \$175,000 or from \$66.23 to \$127.04 per square foot of living area including land.

In comparing the comparable properties to the subject, the appraiser made adjustments for lot size, room count, dwelling size, basement size, garage size and other amenities. The analysis resulted in adjusted sales prices for the comparables ranging from \$169,900 to \$188,000 or from \$71.73 to \$144.54 per square foot of living area including land. From this process, the appraiser estimated a value for the subject by the sales comparison approach of \$175,000 or \$92.11 per square foot of living area including land.

Without further explanation in the final reconciliation, the appraiser concluded an estimate of value of \$175,000 for the subject property.

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's total assessment to \$58,684 which would reflect a market value of approximately \$176,052.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's total assessment of \$60,000 was disclosed. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$180,180 or \$94.83 per square foot of living area including land using the 2008 three-year median level of assessment for DeKalb County of 33.30%.

In response to the appeal, the board of review contends these same appraisals were submitted before it and the board of review believes the assessment of the subject property is correct. As to the Englehart appraisal, the board of review contends while the subject has granite countertops, oak cabinets and six panel doors, there were no adjustments made to the comparables for such amenities. The appraiser also did not make land size adjustments even though the subject is substantially larger than the comparables and the appraiser failed to note the office area in the garage. The appraisal features an incomplete improvement sketch. Lastly, the board of review contends that the three comparable sales were actually one and one-half-story dwellings as compared to the subject's two-story design. As to the Jacobson appraisal, it properly denotes the office area in the garage and has a detailed improvements sketch.

Based on its analyses of these appraisals, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

In written rebuttal, the appellants report that the kitchen does have a granite countertop and oak cabinets, but of the 13 interior doors, only three are six panel oak with the remainder being flush. As to the garage office area, it is used for storage as "this is the only dry area in the building due to persistent roof leaks."

The appellants further report having discussed the board of review's criticisms with each appraiser. Englehart indicated the garage office area added little or no value to the property. Likewise, Jacobsen indicated the granite countertops added little value to the home.

Lastly, in this rebuttal dated in November 2010, the appellants report a nearby property in one of the appraisals, 406 W. Navaho, sold in 2005 for \$152,000 and "just sold" at auction for \$42,000 and is now on the market for \$89,000.

After reviewing the record and considering the evidence, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the

parties and the subject matter of this appeal. The Board further finds that a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The appellants argued that the subject's assessment was not reflective of market value. When market value is the basis of the appeal the value of the property must be proved by a preponderance of the evidence. Winnebago County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 313 Ill. App. 3d 179, 728 N.E.2d 1256 (2nd Dist. 2000); National City Bank of Michigan/Illinois v. Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board, 331 Ill. App. 3d 1038 (3rd Dist. 2002). Proof of market value may consist of an appraisal, a recent arm's length sale of the subject property, recent sales of comparable properties, or recent construction costs of the subject property. *Official Rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board*, 86 Ill.Admin.Code Sec. 1910.65(c). The Board finds this burden of proof has been met and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The Board finds the appellants submitted two appraisals of the subject property with final value conclusions of \$176,500 as of July 17, 2008 and \$175,000 as of May 11, 2006, while the board of review submitted no appraisal or market value evidence, but only criticized various aspects of the appellants' appraisals. The Property Tax Appeal Board finds the criticisms presented by the board of review are either irrelevant to a market value determination or criticized the appraisal methodology in a manner which was not sufficiently supported with contrary market value evidence to overcome the facts presented in the appraisal.

In particular, the criticism of the lack of adjustment for site size in the Englehart appraisal was not supported by substantive sales evidence such as data like a paired-sales analysis depicting an adjustment for land size was warranted. Similarly, the board of review provided no market evidence to show either that adjustments were warranted for granite countertops, six panel doors or an office area in the garage or that the comparable properties did not also have those amenities so that no adjustment was warranted.

The Property Tax Appeal Board finds that a valid criticism of the Jacobsen appraisal would be its date of valuation being about 2 ½ years prior to the assessment date at issue of January 1, 2008. For this lack of proximity in time, the Board has given less weight to the Jacobsen appraisal and finds that the Englehart appraisal with a valuation date of July 17, 2008 is the best evidence of market value of the subject property in the record. Moreover, the board of review provided no sales data to refute these sales which were close in time to the assessment date.

While the board of review raised criticisms and/or shortcomings it perceived in the appellants' appraisals, in the end the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that as outlined above and despite those criticisms, the Englehart appraisal submitted by the appellants estimating the subject's market value of \$176,500 or \$92.89 per square foot of living area including land is still

the best evidence of the subject's market value in the record. Moreover, the appraisal's opinion of value was not substantively challenged with any market value evidence presented by the board of review.

Based upon the market value as stated above, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that a reduction is warranted. Since market value has been established, the three-year median level of assessments for DeKalb County for 2008 of 33.30% shall be applied. (86 Ill.Admin.Code Sec. 1910.50(c)(1)).

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



\_\_\_\_\_  
Member



\_\_\_\_\_  
Member



\_\_\_\_\_  
Member



\_\_\_\_\_  
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 18, 2011



\_\_\_\_\_  
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.