

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Simon & Stephanie Goodall

DOCKET NO.: 12-23672.001-R-1 PARCEL NO.: 02-21-100-028-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Simon & Stephanie Goodall, the appellant(s); 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: \$ 9,455 **IMPR.:** \$ 43,704 **TOTAL:** \$ 53,159

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 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 and masonry construction with 2,600 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1975. Features of the home include a full basement, central air conditioning, three

fireplaces and a two and one-half-car garage. The property has a 54,032 square foot site and is located in Palatine Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-78 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant's appeal is based on overvaluation and equity. In support of the overvaluation argument the appellant submitted evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased on February 28, 2012 for a price of \$325,000. The appellant's evidence indicates the seller was The Northern Trust Company. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to reflect the purchase price.

In support of the equity argument, the appellant submitted three suggested comparable properties.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$53,889. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$556,130 or \$213.90 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the 2012 three year average median level of assessments for class 2 property of 9.69% under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on the sale of the subject and on four suggested comparable sales. In addition, the board of review submitted four suggested equity comparables.

The board of review submitted a brief that argued the sale of the subject was a compulsory sale. In support of this argument, the board submitted a recorder of deeds printout that indicated a lis pendens was placed on the subject property in December 2009. The Judicial Sales Corporation then granted the subject to Northern Trust Company in November 2011. The subject was then conveyed by Wells Fargo bank to the appellant in February 2012.

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

The taxpayer contends 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 the assessment year in question of not less than three comparable properties showing the similarity, proximity and lack of distinguishing characteristics of the assessment comparables to the subject property. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(b). The Board finds the appellant has not met this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be appellant's comparables #2 and #3 and board of review comparables #1, #2 and #4. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$13.09 to \$18.36 per square foot of living area. The subject's assessment of \$17.80 per square foot of living area falls within the range established by the best comparables in this record. Based on this record, the Board did not appellant demonstrate with clear the convincing evidence that the subject's improvement inequitably assessed, a reduction in the and subject's assessment is not justified.

The Board gave little weight to the subject's sale due to the circumstances surrounding the sale. The subject's sale's history calls into question whether the sale was a transaction between a willing seller and a willing buyer. When there is a recent sale of the subject, and that sale is a foreclosure, the Board may consider evidence which would show whether the sale price was representative of the subject's fair cash value. Calumet Transfer, LLC v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 401 Ill.App.3d 652, 657-58.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the four comparable sales submitted by the board of review. These comparables were similar to the subject in location, style, construction, and features. These properties sold proximate in time to the assessment date at issue. The comparables sold for prices ranging from \$208.42 to \$211.78 per square foot of living

area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$213.90 per square foot of living area, including land, which is above the range established by the best comparable sales in this record. 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 Illorioso	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
-	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.