



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

APPELLANT: Stanley E. Wiggins
DOCKET NO.: 13-23946.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 20-08-424-024-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Stanley E. Wiggins, the appellant(s), by attorney Nancy Piña-Campos, Attorney at Law in Cicero; 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:

LAND: \$ 3,404
IMPR.: \$ 18,321
TOTAL: \$ 21,725

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 2013 tax year. The Property Tax Appeal Board (the "Board") finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of the appeal.

Findings of Fact

The subject consists of a two-story dwelling of masonry construction with 5,180 square feet of living area. The dwelling is 86 years old. Features of the home include a full unfinished basement and a one and one-half-car garage. The property has a 6,190 square foot site, and is located in Chicago, Lake Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-11 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance. No evidence was submitted as to whether the subject was owner occupied.

The appellant contend overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted sale and adjustment information on three comparable sales. These comparables sold between April 2012 and January 2013 for between \$8,000 and \$16,000, or \$2.04 to \$5.66 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 \$21,725. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$217,250, or \$41.94 per square foot of living area, including land, when applying the 2013 statutory level of assessment for class 2 property of 10.00% 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 four equity comparables and four sale comparables. These comparables sold between April 2010 and April 2012 for between \$275,000 and \$325,000, or \$75.32 to \$96.67 per square foot of living area.

In rebuttal, the appellant argued that the board of review's comparables were not similar to the subject for various reasons. The appellant also argued that board of review comparable sales #2, #3, and #4 were not advertised for sale on the open market. In support of this assertion, the appellant submitted printouts from redfin.com. The printouts from redfin.com state: that board of review comparable sale #2 was listed on the market on August 17, 2013 and delisted on March 7, 2014; that board of review comparable sale #2 was listed on the market on October 13, 2009, delisted on October 24, 2009, relisted on October 27, 2009, delisted again that same day, relisted the following day on October 28, 2009, delisted again on November 23, 2009, and finally sold on June 28, 2010; and that board of review comparable #4 was sold on October 9, 2009 and then sold again on April 30, 2010 without being listed on the market.

The appellant's petition, rebuttal, and evidence were submitted by Jerri K. Bush. On April 12, 2016, the Board received a Notice of Withdrawal from Ms. Bush, wherein she requested to be withdrawn as counsel of record for the appellant. The Board granted this request, and the appellant proceeded *pro se*. On the day of the hearing, but prior to commencement of the hearing, Nancy Piña-Campos filed a Legal Counsel Authorization, wherein the appellant authorized Ms. Piña-Campos to represent them in the instant matter. The Legal Counsel Authorization included an Appearance. Therefore, the Board granted Ms. Piña-Campos's request, and she was entered as the attorney of record for the appellant in this matter.

At hearing, counsel for the appellant reaffirmed the evidence previously submitted. The board of review reaffirmed the evidence previously submitted, and also argued that the adjustments found in the appellant's "Property Equalization Values" chart were likely generated by an automated system with no human analysis. In rebuttal, counsel reaffirmed the evidence submitted in the appellant's written rebuttal.

Conclusion of Law

The appellants contend 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 appellants did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The Board finds the appellants did not establish any foundation for the adjustments within the “Property Equalization Values” grid, and, therefore, the Board accords these adjustments no weight. However, the Board will look to the raw sales data for these comparables. The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be appellants’ comparables #1, #2, and #3, and board of review comparables #1 and #3. These comparables sold for prices ranging from \$2.04 to \$80.47 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$41.94 per square foot of living area, including land, which is within the range established by the best comparables in this record. Based on this record, the Board finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is not 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



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 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.