



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

APPELLANT: Les Chasteen  
DOCKET NO.: 11-01057.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 17-13-226-003

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Les Chasteen, the appellant, by attorney Clyde B. Hendricks in Peoria, and the Peoria 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 **Peoria** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

**LAND:** \$4,050  
**IMPR.:** \$25,290  
**TOTAL:** \$29,340

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a one-story duplex dwelling of masonry construction containing 1,352 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1954. Features of the home include a concrete slab foundation and central air conditioning.<sup>1</sup> Each side has an attached one-car garage. The property has a 10,000 square foot site and is located in Peoria, Limestone Township, Peoria County.

The appellant's appeal is based on overvaluation. In support of this argument the appellant submitted an appraisal estimating the subject property had a market value of \$89,000 as of October 7, 2011. The appraisal was prepared by J. Greg Fletcher, a State of Illinois Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser. In estimating the market value of the subject property the appraiser developed the income and the sales comparison approaches to value.

In developing the income approach, the appraiser utilized sales of three residential rental comparables with varying degrees of similarity when compared to the subject. The appraiser used the

---

<sup>1</sup> The appraisal states the subject property has central air conditioning. The board of review's grid analysis and property record card is showing the subject property does not have central air conditioning. The pictures of the subject property show a central air conditioning unit in the backyard.

sales and the comparables gross rents to develop a gross rent multiplier. The comparables sold from June 2010 to August 2011 for prices ranging from \$70,000 to \$118,000. The comparables had gross rents ranging from \$970 to \$1,200 resulting in gross rent multipliers ranging from 63.64 to 106.70. Using a monthly rent of \$950 and a gross rent multiplier of 90 the appraiser estimated the subject property had an estimated market value of \$85,500 under the income approach to value.

Using the sales comparison approach, the appraiser provided information of three comparable sales described as one-story or a bi-level duplex dwellings of masonry and frame or masonry construction that ranged in size from 1,312<sup>2</sup> to 1,792 square feet of living area. The dwellings were constructed from 1969 to 1980. Features of the comparables include central air conditioning and each side has a one-car attached garage. Comparable #3 has a lower level. The comparables have sites ranging in size from 8,250 to 12,750 square feet of land area. The comparables sold from June 2010 to August 2011 for prices ranging from \$70,000 to \$118,000 or from \$39.06 to \$89.10 per square foot of living area, including land. After making adjustments to the comparables for differences from the subject the appraiser estimated the comparables had adjusted prices ranging from \$56,900 to \$106,300 or from \$31.75 to \$79.34 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this data, the appraiser estimated the subject had an estimated market value of \$89,000 indicated by the sales comparison approach.

In reconciling the two approaches to value the appraiser gave most weight to the sales comparison approach to value and estimated the subject property had a market value of \$89,000 as of October 7, 2011. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to reflect the appraised value.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's total assessment of \$33,520 was disclosed. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$101,668 or \$75.20 per square foot of living area, including land, when applying the 2011 three year average median level of assessment for Peoria County of 32.97% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In support of the subject's assessment the board of review submitted information on six comparable sales improved with one-story or one and one-half story duplex or triplex dwellings of frame or masonry construction that range in size from 1,224 to 1,888 square feet of living area. The board of review did not disclose the proximity of the comparables in relation to the subject property. The dwellings were constructed from 1940 to 1977. The comparables include central air conditioning. Three

---

<sup>2</sup> The appraiser listed the GLA to be 1,546, when based on the previous page of the appraisal each of the two units were 656 square feet for a total of 1,312 square feet of living area.

of the comparables have full basements with one being finished. Three of the comparables have attached one-car garages for each side. One comparable has a fireplace. The comparables have sites ranging in size from 7,405 to 14,375 square feet of land area. The comparables sold from October 2010 to November 2012 for prices ranging from \$103,500 to \$140,000 or from \$64.72 to \$102.12 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

In rebuttal, the appellant submitted a letter addressing the board of review's evidence. Comparable #1 is 23 years newer and over 500 square feet larger than the subject property. Comparable #6 has a finished basement, unlike the subject property. Furthermore, the appellant argued the board of review did not refute the appellant's appraisal.

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 warranted.

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. National City Bank of Michigan/Illinois v. Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board, 331 Ill.App.3d 1038 (3<sup>rd</sup> Dist. 2002); 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 and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the appraisal of the subject property submitted by the appellant. The appellant's appraiser developed the income and sales comparison approaches to value and gave most weight to the sales comparison approach. The comparables utilized by the appraiser were similar to the subject in size, quality of construction, features, age and land area. The appraiser made reasonable adjustments for any differences to the subject. These properties also sold most proximate in time to the assessment date at issue. The appraised value of \$89,000 is less the market value reflected by the assessment of \$101,668. Less weight was given the comparable sales presented by the board of review due to differences from the subject in location, age, size, and the dates of sale not being proximate in time to the subject's assessment date of January 1, 2011. Based on this record the Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$89,000 as of January 1, 2011. Since market value has been determined the 2011 three year average median level of assessment for Peoria County of 32.97% shall apply. (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(c)(1)/(2)).

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.

*Donald R. Cuit*

Chairman

*K. L. Fern*

Member

*Frank A. Huff*

Member

*Mario Morris*

Member

*J. R.*

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: December 20, 2013

*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.