



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

APPELLANT: Arif Khan  
DOCKET NO.: 12-31234.001-R-1 through 12-31234.002-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Arif Khan, the appellant(s), by attorney Stephanie Park, of Park & Longstreet, P.C. in Rolling Meadows; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented in this matter, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds **No Change** 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:

| DOCKET NO        | PARCEL NUMBER      | LAND   | IMPRVMT | TOTAL    |
|------------------|--------------------|--------|---------|----------|
| 12-31234.001-R-1 | 04-06-401-036-0000 | 11,155 | 30,897  | \$42,052 |
| 12-31234.002-R-1 | 04-06-401-037-0000 | 11,155 | 30,897  | \$42,052 |

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 masonry construction with 5,129 square feet of living area. The dwelling is 27 years old. Features of the home include a full unfinished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a three-car garage. The property has a 19,400 square foot site and is located in Northbrook, Northfield Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-09 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 limited evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased on March 16, 2012 for a price of \$805,000. The appellant's evidence of the subject's sale included a copy of the Settlement Statement and an affidavit from the appellant. 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 \$84,104. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$841,040 or \$163.98 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the level of assessments for class 2 property of 10% under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on three comparable sales.<sup>1</sup>

The appellant submitted a rebuttal brief critiquing the board of review's submission and requesting the appeal be written on the evidence in the record.

### **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.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value in the record to be the board of review's comparable sales #1 and #3. These comparables were similar to the subject in location, style and features. These properties also sold proximate in time to the assessment date at issue. The comparables sold for prices of \$865,000 and 1,100,000 or \$167.60 and \$188.39 per square foot of living area, land included. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$841,040 or \$163.98 per square foot of living area including land, which is supported by the best comparable sales in this record. In addition, the appellant disclosed that after the subject was purchased for \$805,000 the appellant spent \$170,000 on renovations to the subject prior to being occupied, which further supports the subject's assessment. The Board gave little weight to the subject's sale, due to the lack of information as to the length of time the property was exposed on the open market. The appellant partially completed Section IV - Recent Sale Data of the appeal disclosing the parties to the transaction were not related and the property had been advertised on the open market with the Multiple Listing Service (MLS), however, the appellant failed to disclose the length of time the subject was marketed. The appellant submitted a copy of the Settlement Statement and an affidavit from the appellant, however, neither of these documents discloses the length of market exposure, which is an important element of determining whether an arm's length transaction occurred. The Board gave less weight to the board of review's comparable #2 due to its significantly younger age, when compared to the subject. Based on this record the Board finds the subject's assessment is reflective of market value and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not justified.

---

<sup>1</sup> The board of review erroneously listed the subject property as comparable #4 on their sales grid.



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.