

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

| APPELLANT: | David Isom |
|--------------|------------------|
| DOCKET NO.: | 13-03142.001-R-1 |
| PARCEL NO .: | 11-05-200-009 |

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are David Isom, the appellant; and the Franklin County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented in this matter, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds <u>*A Reduction*</u> in the assessment of the property as established by the **Franklin** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

| LAND: | \$4,880 |
|--------|----------|
| IMPR.: | \$20,907 |
| TOTAL: | \$25,787 |

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Franklin 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 one-story pole frame dwelling of steel exterior construction with 1,280 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 2010. Features of the home include a slab foundation, central air conditioning and an attached 2-car garage/barn of 1,280 square feet of building area. The property has an 8.47-acre site and is located in Mulkeytown, Denning Township, Franklin County.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted three appraisals. Appraisal #1, estimated the subject property had a market value of \$42,500 as of March 19, 2008.¹ Appraisal #2 estimated the subject had a market value of \$76,000 as of February 27, 2014. Appraisal #2 was prepared utilizing five comparable sales

¹ Appraisal #1, with a valuation date of 2008 was prepared before the added improvements in 2010. Based on the date of valuation and the changes made to the subject property since preparation of the appraisal, the Board give this evidence no weight in its analysis.

that sold from September 2012 to February 2014 for prices ranging from \$30,000 to \$96,588 or from \$30.00 to \$76.41 per square foot of living area. The comparables were located from 0.06 to 14.61 miles from the subject. The appraiser made various adjustments to the comparables to arrive at adjusted prices ranging from \$56,100 to \$84,500. Appraisal #3 estimated the subject property had a market value of \$87,500 as of January 1, 2011, based on six comparable sales.² Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$34,880. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$102,780 or \$80.31 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the 2013 three-year average median level of assessment for Franklin County of 33.93% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted an appraisal estimating the subject property had a market value of \$112,000 as of January 1, 2013. The appraiser utilized six comparable sales that sold from March 2011 to November 2012 for prices ranging from \$77,000 to \$121,000 or from \$55.23 to \$90.30 per square foot of living area. The comparables were located from 4.25 to 43.80 miles from the subject. The appraiser made various adjustments to the comparables to arrive at adjusted prices ranging from \$90,088 to \$132,000. The appraiser also prepared a cost approach to valued estimating a site value of \$35,500 and an estimated cost new of the subject improvements of \$94,915. Deduction of physical depreciation of \$6,331 and the addition of the site value, indicated an estimated value of the subject via the cost approach to value of \$124,084. 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 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 appraisal submitted by the appellant based on the date of sales utilized and the location of the comparables in relation to the subject. The appellant's appraiser's comparable sales sold for prices ranging from \$30,000 to \$96,588 or from \$30.00 to \$76.41 per square foot of living area. The comparables were located in close proximity to the subject. The appraiser made various adjustments to the comparables to arrive at adjusted prices ranging from \$56,100 to \$84,500. Appellant's comparable #4 was also utilized by the board of review as comparable #1. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$102,780 or \$80.31 per square foot of living area, land included, which is above the appraised value established by the best comparable sales in this record. The Board gave less weight to the

² The dates of sale in appraisal #3 ranged from April 2006 to October 2009. The Board finds the dates of sale are too remote in time from the assessment date in question to be of any value in a determination of the subject's fair market value as of January 1, 2013, and therefore are given no weight.

appraisal presented by the board of review based on the dated sales utilized within the appraisal report and the distant location of the comparables, when compared to the subject. The Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$76,000 as of the assessment date at issue. Since market value has been established the 2013 three-year average median level of assessments for Franklin County of 33.93% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue shall apply. (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(c)(1)).

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.

Mano Moios Chairman Member Member Acting 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 21, 2017

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 <u>PETITION AND</u> <u>EVIDENCE</u> 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.