

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Zheng Chen

DOCKET NO.: 13-02283.001-R-1 PARCEL NO.: 15-27-232-003

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Zheng Chen, the appellant, by Jerri K. Bush, Attorney at Law, in Chicago, and the Kane 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 **Kane** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$2,279 **IMPR.:** \$12,686 **TOTAL:** \$14,965

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Kane County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2013 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 and part one-story dwelling of frame construction with 1,706 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1900. Features of the home include a full basement and a detached 480 square foot garage. The property has a 7,405 square foot site and is located in Aurora, Aurora Township, Kane County.

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 18, 2013 for a price of \$44,900 as depicted in a copy of the Settlement Statement which was submitted with the appeal. Furthermore, Settlement Statement depicts the payment of brokers' fees to two agencies. The appellant also 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 279 days. A copy of the listing data sheet was submitted indicating the property was sold "as-is" and the seller would not be "responsible for any city violations inspections." A copy of the Listing & Property History Report also depicts an original asking price in July 2012 of \$139,900 which was reduced in April 2013 to \$49,900. 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 \$24,362. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$73,137 or \$42.87 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the 2013 three year average median level of assessment for Kane County of 33.31% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In response to the appeal, the board of review noted that the sale of the subject occurred after the assessment date and at the time of the assessment of January 1, 2013 the asking price for the subject property was \$139,900.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on three comparable sales. The comparables consist of a part two-story and part one-story dwelling and two, two-story dwellings of frame, brick or stucco construction. The homes were built between 1909 and 1923 and range in size from 1,288 to 1,809 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a basement, one comparable has a fireplace and each comparable has a garage ranging in size from 280 to 396 square feet of building area. These comparables sold between March 2011 and October 2012 for prices ranging from \$103,500 to \$128,000 or from \$66.35 to \$94.66 per square foot of living area, including land.

Based on this evidence and argument, 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. Except in counties with more than 200,000 inhabitants that classify property, property is to be valued at 33 1/3% of fair cash Fair cash value is defined in value. (35 ILCS 200/9-145(a)). the Property Tax Code as "[t]he amount for which a property can be sold in the due course of business and trade, not under duress, between a willing buyer and a willing seller." (35 ILCS 200/1-50). The Supreme Court of Illinois has construed "fair cash value" to mean what the property would bring at a voluntary sale where the owner is ready, willing, and able to sell but not compelled to do so, and the buyer is ready, willing, and able to buy but not forced to do so. Springfield Marine Bank v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 44 Ill.2d 428 (1970). contemporaneous sale between two parties dealing at arm's length is not only relevant to the question of fair cash value but practically conclusive on the issue on whether the assessment is reflective of market value. Korzen v. Belt Railway Co. of Chicago, 37 Ill.2d 158 (1967). Furthermore, the sale of a property during the tax year in question is a relevant factor in considering the validity of the assessment. Rosewell v. 2626 Lakeview Limited Partnership, 120 Ill.App.3d 369, 375 (1st Dist. 1983).

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 2013 for a price of \$44,900. The appellant provided evidence demonstrating the sale had the elements of an arm's length transaction. The evidence disclosed the parties to the transaction were not related, the property was sold using a Realtor and the property had been advertised on the open market for 279 days. In further support of the transaction the appellant submitted a copy of the MLS listing sheet for the subject property, a copy of the Settlement Statement and a copy of the Listing & Property

History Report. Additionally, the board of review reported the subject's purchase date and price in its grid analysis. The Property Tax Appeal Board finds the purchase price of \$44,900 is below the market value reflected by the assessment of \$73,137.

The Board also 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. The board of review submitted information on three comparable sales. The Board finds these sales do not refute the appellant's evidence that subject property sold after being exposed on the open market for 279 days in a transaction involving parties that were not related. Moreover, two of the sales occurred in 2011, dates more remote in time to the assessment date of January 1, 2013 and thus less likely to be indicative of the subject's estimated market value. To the extent that the board of review has relied upon the asking price of the subject property of \$139,900 or \$82.00 per square foot of living area, including land, as of January 1, 2013, the only recent sale presented by the board of review does not support the subject's asking price since comparable #2 sold in October 2012 for \$128,000 or \$70.76 per square foot of living area, including land.

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 commensurate with the appellant's request 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.

	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:	December 18, 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.