



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

APPELLANT: Mel & Alice Williams  
DOCKET NO.: 08-05044.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 16-29-305-028

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Mel & Alice Williams, the appellants, and the Lake County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, 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:** \$55,760  
**IMPR:** \$173,555  
**TOTAL:** \$229,315

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a two-story dwelling of brick and frame exterior construction containing 2,895 square feet of living area. The home was built in 1978 and features an unfinished basement, central air conditioning, and an attached two-car garage of 483 square feet of building area. The property is located in Deerfield, West Deerfield Township, Lake County.

The appellants' appeal is based on overvaluation of the subject property. The appellants checked the bases of this appeal as recent sale, comparable sales and recent appraisal.

As to the recent sale, the appellants only reported that the subject property was purchased in June 2008 for \$625,000. No settlement statement or other documentation regarding the sale transaction was supplied as requested on the Residential Appeal petition. The appellants further reported the parties to the transaction were not related and the property was sold through a Realtor after being advertised for 13 months in the local newspaper and the Multiple Listing Service. The previous owner of the property was not identified. However, the appellants further reported that the property was sold on "a contract for

deed" and that \$250,000 was expended before the property was occupied in October 2008. The submission was not clear if the total expended on the property was therefore \$875,000.

The appellants also submitted a copy of a letter from National City Bank which referenced the appellant having a right to receive a copy of the appraisal report that was used to determine the value of the real estate which was pledged as collateral for a home equity loan or line of credit. The next two-page document, an AVM report, references a collateral market value of \$559,000 and identifies five sales of properties with, dwelling size, dates and sale prices. The document also specifically states "[t]his is not an appraisal. This report is a reasonable estimate of value based on available public information."

The appellants also submitted a grid analysis of three sales comparables. The properties were improved with two-story brick dwellings that were built between 1977 and 1982. The comparables range in size from 2,434 to 2,888 square feet of living area. Each comparable has an unfinished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace, and a garage of either 440 or 483 square feet of building area. The sales occurred between January 2007 and May 2008 for prices ranging from \$547,500 to \$625,000 or from \$189.58 to \$230.07 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this evidence, the appellants requested a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's final assessment of the subject totaling \$229,315 was disclosed. The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$690,084 or \$238.37 per square foot of living area including land using the 2008 three-year median level of assessments for Lake County of 33.23%.

In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review presented a letter, a grid analysis of three comparable sales along with a map depicting their proximity to the subject, and a copy of a warranty deed concerning the subject property. The warranty deed indicates that the appellants have owned the subject property since 1979 and the board of review reported no record of a sale of the subject property in June 2008 for \$625,000. In the letter, the board of review contends that the AVM report does not constitute an appraisal of the subject property as the report lists five sales, the comparable data is very limited and the report states that it is not an appraisal.

In the board of review's grid analysis, there are three sales of suggested comparable properties. The comparables consist of two-story brick or brick and frame dwellings that were built in 1977 or 1978. The dwellings range in size from 2,434 to 2,888 square feet of living area. Each dwelling has a full unfinished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace, and a garage ranging in size from 440 to 529 square feet of building area. These comparables sold between March and June 2007 for prices ranging from \$665,000 to \$705,000 or from \$235.36 to \$273.21 per

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

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 a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The appellant contends the assessment of the subject property is excessive and not reflective of its 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. National City Bank of Michigan/Illinois v. Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board, 331 Ill.App.3d 1038 (3<sup>rd</sup> Dist. 2002). The Board finds the evidence in the record does not support a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The Board has not given substantive consideration to the AVM report submitted by the appellants. The report was prepared for a home equity loan or line of credit which does not by its terms reflect the estimated fair market value of the subject property. In addition, the AVM report by its own terms is not an appraisal. Moreover, the document contains no descriptive data for the comparables beyond an address, date of sale, sale price and square foot size; there is no analysis of how these properties, if at all, are similar or different from the subject property and how those differences, if any, were considered in determining a value for the subject.

The recent sale evidence on the subject is not supported on this record. While the appellants stated the home was purchased in June 2008 for \$625,000, there is no supporting documentation of that transaction and the board of review reported no record of the transaction. Furthermore, to the extent that the appellants reported expending an additional \$250,000 in renovations prior to occupying the subject property, the sale price plus the cost of renovations would support an increase in the value of the property to approximately \$875,000. Therefore, the Board finds the submissions by the appellants regarding recent sale were not supportive of their overvaluation claim and the same will not be addressed further on this record.

The parties submitted a total of six comparable sales for the Board's consideration. The Board finds the comparables submitted by both parties were similar to the subject in size, design, exterior construction, features, location and/or age. These comparables sold between January 2007 and May 2008 for prices ranging from \$547,500 to \$625,000 or from \$189.58 to \$273.21 per square foot of living area including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of approximately \$690,084 or \$238.37 per square foot of living area including land, which falls within the range established by the most similar comparables in this record. After considering the most comparable sales on this record, the Board finds the appellants

did not demonstrate the subject property's assessment to be excessive in relation to its market value and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted on this record.

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.

*Ronald R. Cuit*

Chairman

*K. L. Fern*

Member

*Frank A. Huff*

Member

*Mario M. Louie*

Member

*Shawn R. Lerbis*

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: August 19, 2011

*Allen Castrovillari*

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.