

# FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Ron Buczko

DOCKET NO.: 09-20881.001-R-1 PARCEL NO.: 16-20-205-009-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Ron Buczko, the appellant, by attorney Arnold G. Siegel, of Siegel & Callahan, P.C. in Chicago; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds <u>a reduction</u> in the assessment of the property as established by the **Cook** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

**LAND:** \$2,205 **IMPR.:** \$4,915 **TOTAL:** \$7,120

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

#### Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Cook County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2009 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 is 95 years old, and consists of a two-story dwelling of frame and masonry construction containing 1,860 square feet of living area. Features of the home include

a full basement and a two-car garage. The property has a 3,150 square foot site and is located in Cicero Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant's appeal is based on overvaluation. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased on September 20, 2006 for a price of \$80,000. The appellant also submitted an affidavit from the owner attesting to an arm's length transaction. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to reflect the purchase price.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$17,306. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$194,449 or \$104.54 per square foot of living area, when using the board of review's indicated size of 1,860 square feet and when using the 2009 three-year median level of assessment of 8.90% for class 2 property as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted information on four suggested comparable sales, one of which also included 2006 sales data. The board of review's submitted evidence disclosed the September 2006 sale of the subject property.

### 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 and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the purchase of the subject property in September, 2006 for a price of \$80,000. The appellant provided an affidavit from the owner attesting to the arm's length transaction. In further support of the transaction, the appellant submitted a copy of the closing statement. The Board finds the board of review did not present any evidence to challenge the arm's length nature of the

transaction or to refute the contention that the purchase price was reflective of market value. Based on this record the Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$80,000 as of January 1, 2009. Since market value has been determined, the 2009 three-year median level of assessment of 8.90% for class 2 property as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue shall apply (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(c)(2)).

Based on this record, the Board finds the subject's assessment is not reflective of market value and a reduction in the subject's assessment is justified.

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.

21. Fer	Chairman
Member	Member
Mauro Illorias	R
Member	Member
DISSENTING:	

### CERTIFICATION

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:	April 24, 2015
•	Alportol
=	Clark of the Droperty Tay Appeal Board

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.