



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

APPELLANT: Alicia Rojas
DOCKET NO.: 12-00460.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 30-07-06-318-003-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Alicia Rojas, the appellant, by attorney Jerri K. Bush in Chicago; and the Will 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 Will County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

**LAND: \$10,791
IMPR.: \$36,036
TOTAL: \$46,827**

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Will County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2012 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 consists of a two-story dwelling of frame construction with 1700 square feet of gross living area.¹ The

¹ The Property Tax Appeal Board finds the best evidence of size was presented by the board of review located in the property record card which contained a

dwelling was constructed in 1998. Features of the home include a concrete slab foundation, central air conditioning and a two-car integral garage containing 550 square feet of building area. The property has a .22-of an acre site and is located in Joliet, Joliet Township, Will County.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased on November 1, 2010 for a price of \$103,000. The appellant completed Section IV - Recent Sale Data of the appeal disclosing the parties to the transaction were not related, the property was sold using a Realtor, the property had been advertised on the open market with the Multiple Listing Service and it had been on the market for 16 days. In further support of the transaction the appellant submitted a copy of the Settlement Statement reiterating the purchase date and price; a copy of the Multiple Listing Service data sheet depicting a listing date of September 13, 2010 with an asking price of \$105,000 and describing the subject as a bank owned which was sold "as is without repair, warranty or seller disclosure"; and a copy of the Listing & Property History Report.

The appellant also submitted information on three comparable sales located from .12 to .23 of a mile from the subject property. Comparable #1 described as a split-level style. No design type was given for comparables #2 and #3. The dwellings were built in 1996 and 1997. The homes contain from 1,593 to 1,706 square feet of living area. Two of the comparables have central air conditioning. One comparable has a fireplace. Each comparable has an attached garage. These properties sold in September 2011 or May 2012 for prices ranging from \$93,000 or \$105,000 or from \$54.51 to \$65.91 per square foot of living area, including land.

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested an assessment of \$32,663 reflects a market value of \$97,999 or \$57.65 per square foot of living area, land included.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$46,827. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$140,875 or \$44.90 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the 2013 three year average median level of

schematic diagram. The appellant's evidence did not include a diagram depicting the size of the subject.

assessment for Will County of 33.24% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In response to the appeal, the board of review submitted a memorandum prepared by and documentation gathered by the Joliet Township Assessor. As to the appellant's comparable sales, the assessor noted each of the properties was a foreclosure. The subject property was a 2010 as is foreclosure sale and now is a rental property.

In support of the subject's assessment, the township assessor prepared a grid analysis of five comparable sales located within 1 mile of the subject. The comparables consist of two-story dwellings of frame construction. The dwellings were built from 1996 to 2003. The homes range in size from 1,616 to 2,072 square feet of living area. The comparables have full or partial unfinished basements. Each comparable has central air conditioning. Three comparables have one fireplace. Each comparable has an attached garage with two being integral. These properties sold between January 2009 and July 2012 for prices ranging from \$125,000 to \$159,000 or from \$67.57 to \$91.58 per square foot of living area, including land.

Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

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 did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

As to the purchase price of the subject property that occurred in November 2010 for \$103,000, the Property Tax Appeal Board has given little weight to this sale which was 14 months prior to the assessment date at issue of January 1, 2012 and therefore is found to be remote in time and less likely to be indicative of the subject's market value as of the assessment date.

As to the subject property's sale and comparable sales presented by the appellant, the board of review noted the properties sold as foreclosure or short sale properties. Section 1-23 of the Code defines compulsory sale as:

"Compulsory sale" means (i) the sale of real estate for less than the amount owed to the mortgage lender or mortgagor, if the lender or mortgagor has agreed to the sale, commonly referred to as a "short sale" and (ii) the first sale of real estate owned by a financial institution as a result of a judgment of foreclosure, transfer pursuant to a deed in lieu of foreclosure, or consent judgment, occurring after the foreclosure proceeding is complete. 35 ILCS 200/1-23.

Section 16-183 of the Code provides that the Property Tax Appeal Board is to consider compulsory sales in determining the correct assessment of a property under appeal stating:

Compulsory sales. The Property Tax Appeal Board shall consider compulsory sales of comparable properties for the purpose of revising and correcting assessments, including those compulsory sales of comparable properties submitted by the taxpayer. 35 ILCS 200/16-183.

Based on these statutes, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds it is appropriate to consider the sale of foreclosure and/or short sale properties in revising and correcting the subject's assessment.

The parties submitted a total of eight comparable sales to support their respective positions before the Property Tax Appeal Board. The Board gave less weight to board of review's comparable #4. This sale occurred in January 2009, which is less indicative of fair market value as of the subject's January 1, 2012 assessment date.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be appellant's comparables along with the board of review comparable sales #1, #2, #3 and #5. The comparables had varying degrees of similarity to the subject property. These similar comparables sold between May 2011 and July 2012 for prices ranging from \$93,000 to \$148,000 or from \$54.51 to \$91.58 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$140,875 or \$44.90 per square foot of living area, including land, which is within the

range established by the best comparable sales in this record and below the range on a per-square-foot basis. Based on this evidence the Board finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is not 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.

Chairman

K. L. Fan

Member

Klaus Albrecht

Member

Jerry White

Member

Acting Member

Robert Steffen

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: December 18, 2015

A. Proctor

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.