

# FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Allan & Lisa Gaynor DOCKET NO.: 12-04071.001-R-1 PARCEL NO.: 09-12-318-010

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Allan & Lisa Gaynor, the appellants, by attorney Brian P. Liston of the Law Offices of Liston & Tsantilis, P.C. in Chicago, and the DuPage County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds <u>no change</u> in the assessment of the property as established by the **DuPage** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

**LAND:** \$90,750 **IMPR.:** \$353,190 **TOTAL:** \$443,940

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

## Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellants timely filed the appeal from a decision of the DuPage 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 part two-story, part three-story and part one-story dwelling of brick exterior construction with 4,185 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 2003. Features of the home include a basement with finished area, central air conditioning, three fireplaces

and a 672 square foot garage. The property has an 11,204 square foot site and is located in Hinsdale, Downers Grove Township, DuPage County.

The appellants contend assessment inequity as the basis of the appeal concerning the subject's improvement assessment. No dispute was raised concerning the land assessment. In support of this argument the appellants submitted limited information on three equity comparables that are 11 or 13 years old and which range in size from 4,192 to 4,967 square feet of living area. No other descriptive characteristics were provided in the grid analysis or spreadsheet of these comparables. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$327,840 to \$348,880 or from \$68.51 to \$78.21 per square foot of living area.

Based on this evidence, the appellants requested an improvement assessment of \$313,643 or \$74.94 per square foot of living area.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$443,940. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$353,190 or \$84.39 per square foot of living area.

The board of review submitted documentation prepared by the township assessor which addressed adjustments to the comparables of both parties for differences from the subject, which were based on the individual components in the cost approach to value that were used to calculate the original assessments for the subject and the comparables. Those "adjusted" improvement assessments range from \$80 to \$92 per square foot of living area, rounded.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review through the township assessor submitted information on four equity comparables of similarly designed dwellings of frame or brick exterior construction. The homes were built between 2001 and 2009 and range in size from 4,250 to 4,533 square feet of living area. Each home has a full or partial basement with finished area, one to three fireplaces and a garage ranging in size from 400 to 660 square feet of building area. These comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$363,070 to \$399,510 or from \$83.40 to \$88.52 per square foot of living area.

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

#### Conclusion of Law

The taxpayers contend assessment inequity as the basis of the appeal. When unequal treatment in the assessment process is the basis of the appeal, the inequity of the assessments must be proved by clear and convincing evidence. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). Proof of unequal treatment in the assessment process should consist of documentation of the assessments for assessment year in question of not less than three comparable properties showing the similarity, proximity lack of distinguishing characteristics of the assessment subject property. 86 Ill.Admin.Code comparables to the §1910.65(b). The Board finds the appellants did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The parties submitted a total of seven equity comparables for the consideration of the Property Tax Appeal Board. comparables have varying degrees of similarity to the subject in features, but each is similar in design, age, size and several These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$68.51 to \$88.52 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$84.39 per square foot living area falls within the range established by the comparables in this record. Based on this record the Board finds the appellants did not demonstrate with clear convincing evidence the that subject's improvement inequitably assessed and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not justified.

The constitutional provision for uniformity of taxation and valuation does not require mathematical equality. requirement is satisfied if the intent is evident to adjust the taxation burden with a reasonable degree of uniformity and if such is the effect of the statute enacted by the General Assembly establishing the method of assessing real property in its general operation. A practical uniformity, rather than an absolute one, is the test. Apex Motor Fuel Co. v. Barrett, 20 Ill. 2d 395 (1960). Although the comparables presented by the parties disclosed that properties located in the same area are not assessed at identical levels, all that the constitution requires is a practical uniformity which appears to exist on the basis of the evidence. For the foregoing reasons, the Board finds that the appellants have not proven by clear convincing evidence that the subject property is inequitably assessed. Therefore, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that

the subject's assessment as established by the board of review is correct and no reduction is warranted.

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
21. Fem	Mauro Morios
Member	Member
a R	Jerry White
Member	Acting Member
Sobert Stoffen	
Acting 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:	November 20, 2015
	Alportol
•	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.