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PURPOSE/SCOPE OF ASSIGNMENT:

I have been retained to offer an opinion on the impact a 120 bed adult alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility would have on existing property values located in the proximate vicinity of 41W400 Silver Glen Road, St Charles, Illinois. Nothing in this opinion is intended to be personally judgmental toward individuals with alcoholism or substance abuse issues nor condemning of facilities that treat such individuals. The purpose of this study is to analyze—(no comma) the impact on residential property values located within a close proximity to the proposed 120 bed alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation treatment facility. This parcel is currently zoned F, (Farming) and Maxxam Partners, LLC has petitioned Kane County for a special use permit allowing the facility to be used in a different and likely disruptive new manner, as an alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation center. Section 4.8-2 (b) and (c) of the Kane County Zoning Ordinance states that a special use allowance “…will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood”. Furthermore, an opinion is also offered on the impact study of MaRous on the proposed alcohol and substance abuse rehabilitation treatment facility.

This report sets out the opinions that I have formed regarding negative externalities (or the perception thereof) in residential neighborhoods and their economic impact on neighboring residential real estate markets. My opinions are based in part on public records data in the area of Campton Hills, Illinois as well as information from the MaRous study. Additionally, opinions are formed based on my published research, an extensive review of related academic literature and industry professionals’ opinions. Furthermore, as a licensed real estate professional, real estate investor and academic, I have personally observed the behavior of participants involved in real
estate transactions surrounding what is perceived to be a negative externality (e.g., places where a murder occurred, a registered sex offender lives or an operating drug treatment center) on neighboring properties.

INFORMATION ABOUT EXPERT

I am a Professor of Finance and Real Estate at Longwood University. I received a Ph.D. in Finance from the University of Mississippi in 1998 and a Ph.D. in Management Information Systems from the University of Mississippi in 2007. The dissertation for the Ph.D. in Finance compared regression and neural networks model for valuation of residential properties. The dissertation for the Ph.D. in MIS also centered on the valuation of residential properties using an expert system. In addition, I am a licensed real estate salesperson (Virginia Real Estate Board-0225179497) and hold an instructor certification in appraisal (Virginia Real Estate Appraiser Board-4002000169). I regularly publish in the area of residential real estate. A significant portion of my empirical research involves the factors that are likely to have an impact on the probability of a successful transaction as well as the effect of negative externalities on the pricing and duration of residential real estate. A complete curriculum vitae is in appendix.
OPINIONS RENDERED

Maxxam Partners, LLC, seek a special use permit that will allow for the operation of a for-profit 120 bed adult alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility, located at 41W400 Silver Glen Road, St Charles, Illinois. This facility will bring about a loss in utility for neighboring residents in the forms of decreased property values, increased traffic volumes, increased crime rates and overall declines in neighborhood quality. The overall housing value loss to the greater neighborhood is expected to be in excess of $12 million.¹

OPINION #1: It is my professional opinion that the establishment of a 120 bed for-profit alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility to be located at 41W400 Silver Glen Road, St Charles, Illinois (formerly Glenwood School for Boys) will be significantly detrimental to nearby property values as a result of the increased risks (or perceived risks) of residing near such a facility. The marketplace considered in this opinion is largely representative of and consistent with the empirical research cited in this opinion.

This opinion is based in part on an abundance of academic and empirical studies (discussed later) which show the existence of a negative externality to have a negative impact on nearby real property values. Specifically, such a facility would at a minimum:

- Negatively impact property values in the surrounding areas of the proposed facility anywhere from 8-17%, an estimate which is based on inferences drawn from similar empirical studies (cited throughout opinion). For the average property located in the Campton Hills area, this could be a loss of $43,813 - $93,103 in property value.²

---

¹ Based on average listings over the last 12 months. The impact on property values are forecasted to be 17% for properties located within a one mile radius and an 8% impact for those between a 1 and 3 mile radius.
² Average property value of properties listed over last 12 months times 17% (547,662 x .17 = 93,103)
• For more expensive properties in excess of $2 million the loss in value could exceed $400,000.

• As a result of the increased degree of risk or perceived degree of risk posed by the proposed 120 bed adult alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility, there will be more of a negative impact on nearby property values then the impact of the facility examined by MaRous. As shown by LaRoche, Waller and Wentland (2014), as the homeowner’s perception of risk increases so will the value of the negative externality resulting in lower neighborhood property values.

• The most severe impact on property values will be those located nearest the proposed facility. There exists a significant amount of research that shows negative externalities have the most severe impact on properties located closest to the externality (LaRoche, Waller, Wentland, 2014; Wentland, Waller and Brastow, 2014; Farber, 1999; Congdon-Hohman, 2013; Turnbull, Waller, Wentland, Witschey and Zahironic-Herbert, 2015). It is likely that all properties that fall within a 3-mile radius (see graphic below) will be negatively impacted by the proposed alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility.

• The mostly rural location of the proposed 120 bed adult alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility will be a significant factor in the influence of property values. Wentland, Waller and Brastow (2014) find that residents in suburban/rural areas consider larger geographical areas when defining who constitutes a “neighbor” and as such it is logical to expect that residents in the Campton Hills, unincorporated Kane County, and St. Charles area will also assess the risk out farther from the facility than would residents in a similar facility in an urban area.
The more expensive properties in the immediate area will be impacted more severely in terms of loss in value. The graphic below illustrates those properties that sold in the last 12 months within a 3-mile radius of the proposed 120 bed alcoholism and abuse rehabilitation facility. It is readily apparent that there are numerous properties in the area that are likely to be impacted by the proposed facility.

BASIS FOR OPINION #1:

It is widely held in real estate that any modification of existing land uses in a close proximity to an existing residential property will economically impact said property. Such externalities may be an intangible, largely determined by public perception, which is capitalized into the selling price of nearby residential properties (LaRoche, Waller and Wentland, 2014). The intangible discussed here is the fear and anxiety of an alcoholism and substance abuse
rehabilitation treatment facility. It has long been acknowledged the existence of numerous externalities to have an impact on the marketing outcome of residential real estate. The direction of the impact is dependent upon the perceived influence of the modification (proposed facility). For example, the location of a landfill will have a negative impact on values of existing residential properties, whereas the development of a community park will increase property values. Similarly, the construction of a 4,000 square foot luxury home in the neighborhood of mostly 2,000 square foot homes would positively impact values of the smaller properties in the neighborhood.

A consequence of locating a 120 bed alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation treatment facility in residential areas is that many patients leave the program before completion (Shaffer, 2012). Furthermore, the large degree of correlation between crime and alcohol or drug use is well documented. In addition to alcohol and substance abuse addiction, many patients of substance abuse facilities are likely to have other mental health issues. Indeed, the current petitioner is proposing to treat dual diagnosis patients seeking both mental health and substance abuse treatment. Connery (2011) finds substance abuse to be multifaceted and the fact that many patients have a dual diagnosis of mental health issues as well as a substance addiction. This is important to note as Dear, Taylor and Hall (1980) in a survey of over 1000 households find that mental health facilities generate fears concerning property values, traffic volume and overall neighborhood satisfaction. The authors also show that as the proximity to such a facility increases, so does the perceived undesirability of such a facility. Public awareness and type of facility both have an effect on the results, although proximity is clearly the dominant factor. This is particularly relevant to this study as there are many properties located in near proximity of the proposed

---

3 http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/DRRC_PDF (last visited on 1/9/16).
4 In a 2007 survey by the Substance Abuse Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA, 2008), 39% of clients in treatment centers had mental health issues as well as substance abuse addiction.
facility. Many families of a drug addict refuse to “enable” their behavior forcing the addict to experience the consequences of their action of refusing treatment. Such “tough love” may force the addict to fend for themselves resulting in undesirable behaviors in attempts to fuel their addiction (LaRoche, Waller and Wentland, 2014). The likelihood of relapse (Shaffer, 2012) coupled with the probability of criminal activity associated with alcoholism and substance abuse validates the argument that such a facility is likely to promote objectionable and undesirable consequences in the community such as decreased property values and an overall decrease in quality of life for existing residents (LaRoche, Waller and Wentland, 2014).

An article published by the Appraisal Institute (2013), cautions “potential homebuyers that bad neighbors can significantly reduce nearby property values”. The article goes on to warn homebuyers to visit the neighborhood on several different occasions to fully understand what is happening in the neighborhood. Realtors also offer similar advice to potential homebuyers advising them to talk with neighbors about the neighborhood (www.marketwatch.com, 2011). Appraisal Institute President Richard L. Borges warns that “external factors, such as living near a bad neighbor, can lower home values by more than 5 to 10 percent” going on to warn potential homebuyers to be aware of the proximity to commercial facilities as they also can negatively affect home values (Appraisal Institute, 2013). If a neighborhood becomes less desirable for any of a number of reasons, such as the location of an alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation center, such a detrimental externality will decrease the value of the neighborhood properties, making it more affordable to lower-income families and less attractive to higher-income families. Over time, higher-income residents may relocate. As a result, the by-products of high-income residents, such as social status, school quality, low crime and well-maintained, owner-occupied homes, may dissipate. McCluskey and Rausser (2003) find that higher income households require
larger and significant discounts to live in close proximity to a negative externality. Similarly, Farber (1998) finds that undesirable land uses expected to impose a negative externality on surrounding properties are translated into negative and economically significant pricing discounts on adjacent property values. Such negative effects may persist even when such land uses provide offsetting advantages such as employment opportunities. “The larger the facility, the greater the potential impact with the precise impact of the externality source will depend on the characteristics of the population with which it intersects” (Farber, 1998). Taylor and Hall (1977) shows that response to externalities will vary with the socioeconomic structure of the neighborhood. It is possible to observe different reactions to an identical externality source according to the subpopulation’s attitudinal response. Results show that a resource-rich middle class neighborhood is more likely to defend such an encroachment more vociferously than lower income, more transient, resource deficient areas (Dear, Taylor and Hall, 1980). Although treatment centers tend to be as inconspicuous as possible, there are reasons to believe that such facilities adversely impact neighborhood values (LaRoche, Wentland and Waller, 2014).

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

A triggering event, such as the location of a negative externality such as the proposed 120 bed substance abuse rehabilitation facility, may result in direct damage; however there might be a spillover or multiplier effect as well. The resulting and additional damage is called consequential damage. Once a stigma becomes associated with a particular neighborhood, property values may be stigmatized for decades. This reluctance to buy can be reflected in lower residential property values and may be based on perceived risk that may or may not have a scientific foundation. (McCluskey and Rausser, 2003). Drawing on the related academic literature cited herein, the proposed 120 bed alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation center will likely be a driving
factor in two noxious externalities. The first is the impact it will have on nearby properties; the stigma of the facility will impact the neighboring property owner's utility (e.g., safety, inconvenience, property values). The second is the neighborhood externality impact the proposed facility will have on the composition of residents in the neighborhood bringing about a change in overall neighborhood quality.

Such conflict revolving around externality issues have been lamented upon by legal and academic scholars for decades. There are numerous empirical studies that show how externalities, both positive and negative impact property values in near proximity to the externality. Given that one's primary residence is typically the average individual's largest investment, it is not surprising that the mantra of "location, location, location" is of considerable and ever growing concern of buyers of residential real estate (LaRoche, Wentland and Waller, 2014). Savvy potential home buyers diligently research the communities in which they are considering living including, school systems, crime rates, sex offenders, etc. (LaRoche, Wentland and Waller, 2014; Wentland, Waller and Brastow, 2014).

Examples of externalities having a positive impact on property values include nearby renovated properties through the use of rehabilitative tax credits (Turnbull, Waller, Wentland Witschey and Zahirovic-Herbert, 2015); the creation of a historic district (Coffin, 1989; Clark and Herrin, 1997); historical properties (Coulson and Leichenko, 2001); near proximity to high-rise office buildings (Thibodeau, 1990); properties located near a resort community (Spahr and Sunderman, 1999) and neighborhood parks (Espey and Owusu-Edusei, 2001).

Similarly, numerous empirical studies provide evidence that properties located within a close proximity to an externality with a perceived negative stigma is likely to deter the marketability and value of neighboring properties. Such impacts are likely to decrease the
likelihood of a sale, decreased selling price and decreased liquidity (longer marketing times). Empirical studies reflecting decreased property values as the result of negative externalities include those located near rental properties (Wang, Grissom, Webb and Spellman, 1991); churches (Do, Wilbur and Short, 1994); elevated rates of crime (Thaler, 1978; Gibbons, 2004; Ihlanfeldt and Mayock, 2010; Pope, 2012; Buck, Deutsch, Hakim, Spiegel and Weinblatt, 1991); landfills (Nelson, Genereux and Genereux, 1992; Reichert, Small and Mohanty, 1992; Hite, Hitzhusen and Randall (2001)); increased levels of automobile traffic (Hughes and Sirmans, 1992); airport noise (Mieszkowski and Saper, 1978; Nelson, 1979; and O'Byrne, Nelson and Seneca, 1985); power lines (Francois, 2002); foreclosed properties (Harding, Rosenblatt and Yao, 2009; Lin, Rosenblatt and Yao, 2009; Daneshvary, Clauretie and Kader, 2011; Danesvary and Clauretie, 2012; Agarwal, Ambrose, Chomsisengphet and Saunders, 2013; Bian, Brastow, Waller and Wentland, 2014); shopping centers (Des Rosier, 1996); sex offenders (Wentland, Waller, and Brastow, 2014; Linden and Rockoff, 2008; Pope, 2008) and substance abuse rehabilitation treatment centers (LaRoche, Waller and Wentland, 2014).

Simons and Saignor (2006) did a meta-analysis study where 75 peer-reviewed journal articles on externalities and their impact on value based on the proximity to the externality. Of those 75 studies, 58 involved negative externalities and the remaining 17 were studies dealing with positive externalities. It is also important to note that of the 58 negative externality studies, 19 (33%) were published in the Appraisal Journal, which is largely a practitioner’s publication. This illustrates the huge impact that externalities have on the valuation process.

More specifically and germane to this opinion is the consistent and significant empirical findings that demonstrate the importance of proximity or distance from a nearby externality and its impact on value to neighboring properties. Turnbull, Waller, Witschey, Wentland and
Zahirovic-Herbert (2015) examine the impact properties that have been preserved or renovated with rehabilitative tax credits (RTCs) on neighboring property values within and outside of historical districts. The authors find that of the 11,737 properties located within .10 miles of an RTC property sell on average for a 6% price premium relative to comparable properties without the positive externality of a close proximity to an RTC property. The pricing effect is significant on properties located up to 2 miles from an RTC property. Espey and Owusu-Edusei (2001) examine the pricing effect of single family homes based upon their proximity to neighborhood parks. The authors find that the greatest impact on housing values was their proximity to small neighborhood parks with property values as much as 13% higher for homes located up to 500 feet away and 6.5% higher for those properties between 500 and 1,500 feet. Francois (2002) examines the impact of high-voltage transmission lines on surrounding property values and find home values to depreciate on average 10%, however for properties located where the setback boundary is only 50 ft., their loss in value is 14%. Furthermore the authors find discrimination in valuation loss as lower priced properties suffered on average a 10-15% decrease in value, whereas more expensive properties had value diminution in the 15-20% range. Bian, Brastow, Waller and Wentland (2015) examine the impact of marketing time and probability of sale on how nearby foreclosed properties impact neighboring homes. The author’s find that a typical home located within .10 of a mile of a foreclosure may take 16% longer to sell than an otherwise comparable home, and may be 29% less likely to sell at all. Their findings all confirm that the loss in property value is the result of the dis-amenity effect and not the supply effect of nearby foreclosed properties. Congdon-Hohman (2013) finds that properties located within one-quarter of a mile of a methamphetamine lab suffer significant decreases in value of between 10-19% with a diminishing effect the further the distance from the lab. Reichert, Small, and Mohanty (1992) in an examination of the impact of landfills on
property values find a negative impact on value when located within several blocks. The authors find a negative pricing effect ranging from 5.5% - 7.3% depending on the distance from landfill with a less pronounced effect on less expensive and older properties (3-4%). Also, a study by Hite, Hitzhusen and Randall (2001) find a negative pricing impact for properties located within 3.25 miles of a landfill. The authors also find the negative pricing effect of the landfill to remain even after it has been closed for a number of years. Linden and Rockoff (2008) find declines in property values of 4% following the arrival of a sex offender in the neighborhood. For properties located adjacent to the sex offender, property values are negatively impacted by 12%. Pope (2008) also examines the impact of a registered sex offender and finds that when a sex offender moves into a neighborhood nearby properties values fall by 2.3%. Similarly Wentland, Waller and Brastow (2014) find a 10.3% negative pricing effect on neighboring properties within 0.1 miles of a registered sex offender. This is approximately 3 times the magnitude of the impact found by Pope (2008), suggesting a higher willingness to pay to avoid such a negative externality for residents in the predominantly suburban and rural areas considered in their study. The authors further explore whether or not the market differentiates between violent and non-violent sex offenders and discover that violent offenders have a more significant and negative impact on nearby property values. Property values located within 0.1 mile from a violent sex offender will be negatively impacted by $17,595, while a nearby non-violent sex offender reduces a home’s sale price by only $2,639. Possibly an even more alarming result is the fact that nearby (or < 0.1 mile) from a violent sex offenders will increase a home’s marketing duration by 125 days, while a nearby non-violent sex offender increases a home’s time on market by about a month. The negative and significant impact on value is shown to persist up to a 1 mile radius whereas other sex offender studies find no significant impact of a sex offender on property values beyond 0.3 miles, suggesting the
significant difference to be attributable to what residents consider “neighbors” in the suburban/rural relative to urban areas (Wentland, Waller, and Brastow, 2014). Residences in suburban/rural areas like central Virginia tend to be less densely located than areas such as Charlotte, NC and Tampa, FL which were the focus of the studies by Linden and Rockoff (2008) and Pope (2008) respectively. Wentland, Waller and Brastow (2014) put forth that residents in suburban/rural areas distinguish properties within a larger radius as neighbors, resulting in a greater alertness or aversion to crime risk over larger distances. Such declining magnitudes of coefficients across distance conforms to the rational expectation that risk falls as the physical distance from a perceived threat rises.

LaRoche, Waller and Wentland (2014) examine over a decade (2001-2011) of approximately 200,000 residential real estate transactions from central Virginia which includes urban, suburban and rural areas. The MLS data used by the authors includes the greater Richmond area which is representative and typical of other U.S. housing markets. The average property in the data has a listing and selling price of $263,641 and $242,116 respectively. The authors specifically explore the impact of substance abuse rehabilitation centers on selling prices and liquidity of nearby residential properties. The authors compute the distance from each home in the data set to each treatment facility and find a negative pricing effect of approximately 8% for those properties located within 1/8th of a mile of a rehab center. The authors further determine that abuse rehabilitation facilities for treating heroin addicts have a more pronounced impact on values of up to 17% for properties located within 1/8 of a mile of such a facility. The authors find their results to be robust across multiple methodologies and conclude that unobserved spatial heterogeneity is not a contributing factor. That is their findings provide strong evidence that their results are not the consequence of a “bad part of town” effect and insistently conclude there is a robust and
negative relationship between the presences of a substance abuse rehabilitation treatment center and nearby home values. Farber (1998) looks at a summary of empirical studies on undesirable land uses finds that undesirable facilities reduce property values in their vicinity with diminishing effects as distances from the undesirable use increases. The author also points to evidence that these negative effects may be more severe in thin markets of rural areas more so than urban areas.

To reiterate, the voluminous empirical studies cited here provide ample evidence that the establishment of a for-profit 120 bed alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility to be located at 41W400 Silver Glen Road, St Charles, Illinois (formerly Glenwood School for Boys) would bring about at a minimum;

- Negatively impact property values in the surrounding areas of the proposed facility from 8% to 17%.
- Homeowners will perceive a 120 bed adult alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility to present significant risks facility thereby creating a negative externality resulting in lower property values. Specifically, homes located near an alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility like the one proposed in St. Charles, Illinois, will sell for a larger discount relative comparable homes.
- Given the rural nature of the proposed 120 bed alcoholism and abuse rehabilitation facility, it likely that the negative impact will be more severe in terms of both value and breadth given the tendency of residents in suburban/rural areas like Campton Hills to consider larger areas when defining who constitutes as a “neighbor” and assessing subsequent risks (Wentland, Waller and Brastow, 2014).
- The most severe impact on property values will be those located nearest the proposed 120 bed alcoholism and abuse rehabilitation facility. The graphic below depicts those
properties that were listed (white dots) and sold (red dots) within a 3 mile radius over the past 12 months.

- Have a larger and more severe impact on more expensive properties in the area. The graphic below depicts those properties that sold for $250,000 or more within the last 12 months.
**OPINION #2:** The MaRous impact study supposes there to be no significantly negative impact on property values located nearby the proposed facility. I have thoroughly reviewed the MaRous opinion and find some areas of concern in the study.

- The MaRous study uses a matched-pair analysis to purport no differences in property values for those properties located near a former facility for troubled youth and not the 120 bed adult alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility such as the one proposed in St. Charles. Analyses using a matched-pair approach is very subjective and can be easily manipulated through property selection.

- Park Ridge, Illinois is the area used in the MaRous matched-pair analysis study and is not comparable to the Campton Hills area, where the proposed facility is to be located. The Park Ridge area is a suburban/urban area and significantly larger than Campton Hills which is of a more rural area in nature. The former Park Ridge facility is no longer operational and being converted to a park.
The MaRous study also conducts a valuation of an existing property located near the proposed facility in St. Charles. However, this valuation has no current or predictive value of how market values will be impacted if the proposed 120 bed adult alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation center becomes a reality.

The impact study by MaRous is based upon a matched-pair analysis of properties located near a facility in Park Ridge, Illinois, which was formerly a facility for troubled youth. The facility is now being revamped into a park. The opinion offered in the MaRous impact study puts forth there to be no significantly negative impact on residential property values in close proximity to the proposed facility based on a matched-pair analysis conducted in the area of the former Park Ridge Youth facility. The former Park Ridge Youth facility is located in the suburban area of Park Ridge, Illinois and is located across the street from the Park Ridge Country Club. The findings are based on a matched-pair analysis comparison, which is a practical and excellent means of residential valuation in theory, however in practice much more problematic and difficult. In an appraisal forum discussion concerning matched pair analysis, one appraiser had this to say, "Great in theory, difficult in practice…matched-pairs, that is." Also, theoretically a matched-pair analysis assumes that the two properties chosen for comparison have only a singular difference, which in this situation is presumed to be the proximity near the former Park Ridge Youth facility. Another pertinent question from the appraisal forum referenced above concerning the selection of properties for comparison was "how often do you find 2 sales but with a single difference between the two?" In fact, as a licensed appraisal instructor, I demonstrate this dilemma of comparable property selection when teaching real estate appraisal courses by assigning the same property to be appraised by two students. One is assigned to valuate and appraise the property for the highest

6 http://apraisersforum.com/forums/threads/matched-paired-analysis.151233/
justifiable value based on comparable properties while the other student is assigned to appraise the same property for the lowest justifiable value based on comparable properties.

In the MaRous study, the first matched pair analysis compares 339 Edgemont Lane, Park Ridge, IL with 125 E. Kathleen Drive, Park Ridge, IL. According to MaRous, the property located at 339 Edgemont (close to previous Park Ridge Youth facility) last sold in June 2011 for $370,000 after being marketed for 67 days (see figure below of matched-pair properties). The property did transact for a $29,000 discount relative to asking price. The comparison property located at 125 E. Kathleen Drive, Park Ridge, IL, sold in November, 2011 for $412,000 after being marketed for only 5 days. This was an $8,000 discount in price relative to the list price of $420,000. Also, as shown in the figure below, 339 Edgemont Lane is in close proximity to both Northeast Park and Park Ridge Country Club, which are considered to be positive externalities and thus having an impact on nearby property values.
The second matched-pair analysis compares 314 W. Cuttriss street, Park Ridge, IL to 725 N. Elmore Street, Park Ridge IL. The 314 W. Cuttriss property listed for $1,049,000 and sold for
$855,000 in August, 2008 after being marketed for 71 days for a discount of $194,000. The comparison property located at 725 N. Elmore listed for $798,000 and sold for $745,000 in October 2009 after 105 days on the market for a discount of $53,000. Some notable differences in characteristics of the 314 W. Cuttriss property relative to the suggested comparable of 725 N. Elmore (cookcountyassessor.com) that bring into question whether or not these are good comparable properties include the significant difference in living area (3,298 vs. 2,360), type of exterior (Frame/Masonry vs. Frame only), presence of central air, type and size of garage and lot size (11,450 vs 9,600 sqft.). As with the first matched-pair analysis, the proximity to the Park Ridge Country Club and considered to be a positive externality impacting nearby property values further increasing the already difficult and subjective process of value adjustment in matched-pair analysis.

The third matched-pair analysis compares 322 W. Cuttriss, Park Ridge, IL to 528 N. Merrill Ave, Park Ridge, IL. The 322 W. Cuttriss property was listed for $889,000 and sold for $851,000 in August, 2007 after spending 7 days on the market. The comparable property, located at 528 N. Merrill Ave listed for $884,000 and sold for $812,500 in October, 2007 after spending 74 days on the market. As with both previous matched-pair analyses, the Park Ridge Country Club will likely have a positive impact on nearby properties making the value adjustment process more uncertain.

In summary, matched-pair analysis is a subjective methodology that can be exploited to achieve any result the investigator desires by searching out comparison properties that supports the desired conclusion.\(^7\) As can be seen in figure below, there are a multitude of residential properties in the Park Ridge area from which the investigator could have selected for use in comparison. Even the most experienced appraiser would have difficulty examining all of the

possible properties to insure that the absolute most similar property was selected. "Traditional appraisal methods contain a high potential for bias, because the appraiser often engages in the highly questionable practice of "data mining" by selecting comparable sales to support a preconceived value consideration." Finally, the former Park Ridge Youth facility is located in a very close proximity to Northeast Park and the Park Ridge Country Club, both of which are positive externalities impacting value which further convolutes the already difficult and subjective process of value adjustment in matched-pair analysis.

The MaRous impact study also did an analysis of a recently sold property in the vicinity of the proposed alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation center in St. Charles, IL. The property the investigator uses as the subject property is 41W625 West Foxtail Circle, St. Charles, IL suggested a list of comparable properties listed in the table and figure below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comp 1</th>
<th>Property address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comp 2</td>
<td>7N108 Hastings Drive, St Charles, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp 3</td>
<td>41W686 Privet Ct., Campton Hills, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp 4</td>
<td>40W654 Willowbrook Dr., St. Charles, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp 4</td>
<td>7N311 Red Barn Lane, Campton Hills, IL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[http://realstat.com/download/discredit.pdf\]
The investigator values the property located at 41W625 West Foxtail Circle, St. Charles, IL to be between $365,000 and $385,000. The property sold for $375,000 after being on the market for 8 days. However, this valuation is not pertinent to this opinion given that the negative externality of the proposed facility does not currently exist.
SUMMARY OF IMPACT OF ALCOHOLISM AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE REHABILITATION FACILITY

It is my professional opinion that the proposed 120 bed adult alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility will have significant and negative impact on the community including, but not limited to the following:

- A negative impact on property values in the surrounding areas of the proposed facility ranging from 8% to 17%. For the average property located in the Campton Hills area, this could be a loss in value of over $93,103 in property value. Based on the 269 of 486 properties that were listed for sale over the last 12 months within a 3 mile radius of the proposed 120 bed alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility, the average loss in value would at a minimum exceed $12 million for the greater neighborhood.

- Properties located in the closest proximity to the proposed facility will be impacted more harshly than those with a larger distances from the facility. There exist a significant amount of research that shows negative externalities have the most severe impact on value the more proximate the properties to the externality (in this case the proposed abuse rehabilitation facility) (LaRoche, Waller, Wentland, 2014; Wentland, Waller and Brastow, 2014; Dear, Taylor and Hall, 1980; Farber, 1999; Congdon-Hohman, 2013; Turnbull, Waller, Wentland, Witschey and Zahirovic-Herbert, 2015). It is likely that all properties that fall within the graphic below will be negatively impacted by the proposed alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility.
- It is expected that those properties located within a 1 mile radius will be the most devalued by the proposed 120 bed alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility with losses in value of approximately $3 million based on the properties that were listed for sale over the last 12 months.

- Properties located between 1 and 3 miles of the proposed facility will suffer an estimated loss in property value as much as $10 million based on the properties that were listed for sale over the last 12 months.

- The more expensive properties in the immediate area of the proposed 120 bed alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility will be more severely impacted in terms of value loss. Of the 485 properties that sold over the last 12 months, 50% or 244 of these properties sold for $449,900 or more. In fact, properties that transacted in the upper 25 percentile (122 properties) sold for $600,000 or more. Thus it is readily apparent that there are
numerous properties that will be impacted by the proposed 120 bed alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility resulting in significantly large losses in property values.

- As a result of the increased degree of risk posed by the proposed 120 bed adult alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility, there will be a more severe, negative impact on nearby property values than the impact of the facility presented by MaRous, which posed a lower degree of risks to nearby homeowners. As shown by LaRoche, Waller and Wentland (2014), as the homeowner’s perception of risk increases so will the negative externality resulting in lower neighborhood property values. The proposed 120 bed adult alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility is likely to be perceived by the typical homeowner to have significant risks resulting in a negative externality to the Campton Hills community resulting in lower property values.
  - Given that extensive estimate in property value loss of over $21 million associated with the proposed 120 bed alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation center, there will be an unintended consequence of loss in real estate tax revenue.

- The mostly rural location of the proposed 120 bed adult alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility will be a significant factor in the influence of property values. Wentland, Waller and Brastow (2014) find that residents in suburban/rural areas consider larger geographical areas when defining who constitutes a “neighbor” and assign risk in a broader geographical area.
  - The rural area has somewhat of a double-edge sword effect (see figure of area below). One is that residents in such communities consider a larger geographical area when assessing externality risks (Wentland, Waller and Brastow, 2014). That
is the proposed 120 bed alcoholism and substance abuse rehabilitation facility will have a more far-reaching impact on property values than if it were to be located in an urban area. A second effect of the rural location is liquidity impact that such a facility will have on properties being marketed for sale. Rural areas tend to have less liquidity (marketability) due to the simple economic concept of supply and demand. That is there are simply more buyers and sellers in urban markets than rural ones. The decreased marketability of properties due to the rural nature of the area coupled with the negative externality of the proposed facility will significantly impact the marketing outcomes of both selling price and marketing time.

Regardless of the separation by from “most residential dwellings” such separation will have no impact on the stigma effect that will be associated with the proposed 120 bed adult alcoholism and substance detox facility. Furthermore, the water tower for the proposed

\[5\text{ MaRous Impact study}\]
facility is quite an obvious fixture and will certainly be a topic of question for future homebuyers in the area.

- Regardless of highest and best use for the existing property, demand for the existing facility or financial benefits to taxing bodies, such a facility will negatively impact neighboring properties values and thus should not be permitted under section 4.8-2 (b) and (c) of the Kane County Zoning Ordinance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTIES LISTED</th>
<th>FULL SAMPLE</th>
<th>1 MILE</th>
<th>2 MILE</th>
<th>3 MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVG. PRICE</td>
<td>547,662</td>
<td>452,124</td>
<td>392,104</td>
<td>537,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>266,163,732</td>
<td>14,920,092</td>
<td>20,781,512</td>
<td>98,355,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVG. PROPERTY LOSS (14%)</td>
<td>76,673</td>
<td>63,297</td>
<td>54,895</td>
<td>75,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOSS @8%</td>
<td>21,293,099</td>
<td>1,193,607</td>
<td>1,662,521</td>
<td>7,868,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOSS @ 17%</td>
<td>45,247,834</td>
<td>2,536,416</td>
<td>3,532,857</td>
<td>16,720,381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTIES SOLD</th>
<th>FULL SAMPLE</th>
<th>1 MILE</th>
<th>2 MILE</th>
<th>3 MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVG. PRICE</td>
<td>532,072</td>
<td>415,528</td>
<td>352,752</td>
<td>510,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>164,410,248</td>
<td>9,972,672</td>
<td>10,582,560</td>
<td>54,674,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVG. PROPERTY LOSS (14%)</td>
<td>74,490</td>
<td>58,174</td>
<td>49,385</td>
<td>71,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOSS @8%</td>
<td>13,152,820</td>
<td>797,814</td>
<td>846,605</td>
<td>4,373,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOSS @ 17%</td>
<td>27,949,742</td>
<td>1,695,354</td>
<td>1,799,035</td>
<td>9,294,617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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