

# FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Timothy Ramseyer & Patrick Koziol

DOCKET NO.: 14-02344.001-R-1 PARCEL NO.: 06-22-277-007

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Timothy Ramseyer & Patrick Koziol, the appellants, 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>no change</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:** \$8,827 **IMPR.:** \$33,416 **TOTAL:** \$42,243

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

## Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellants 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 2014 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 1-story and part 1.5-story dwelling of frame construction with 1,539 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1948. Features of the home include a partial basement with finished area and an attached 308 square foot garage. The property is located in Elgin, Elgin Township, Kane County.

The appellants contend overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellants submitted information on both the recent sale of the subject and on four comparable sales.

As to the sale of the subject property, the appellants submitted evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased November 7, 2012 for a price of \$37,905. The appellants 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 was on the market for 10 days. In further support of the transaction the appellants submitted a copy of the Settlement Statement reiterating the purchase price and date; a copy of the Multiple Listing Service data sheet depicting that the home was sold asis for cash and was an REO/Lender owned, Pre-foreclosure; and a copy of the Listing & Property History Report depicting the property was nearly continuously on the market as of February 4, 2011 with an asking price of \$95,000 at that time, a three month break in the listing from March to June 2012, and then an asking price of \$39,900 as of July 3, 2012.

The appellants also submitted information on four comparable sales where comparable #1 is also the subject property. comparables are located within .87 of a mile from the subject property. The three comparable properties consist of a part 1story and part two-story dwelling and two, part 1-story and part 1.5-story dwellings that were built between 1898 and 1940. homes range in size from 1,395 to 1,709 square feet of living Each of the comparables features a full or partial basement, one comparable has central air conditioning and two comparables have a fireplace. Two of the comparables also have garage of 384 and 440 square feet of building area, respectively. These three comparable properties sold in July 2012 and September 2013 for prices ranging from \$37,500 to \$62,000 or from \$26.88 to \$38.33 per square foot of living area, including land.

Based on this evidence, the appellants requested a total assessment reflective of the purchase price.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$42,243. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$126,742 or \$82.35 per square foot of living area, land

included, when using the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.

In response to the appeal and in support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review through the township assessor submitted a memorandum contending that the subject is not owner occupied and that the property has been remodeled since the purchase in 2012. Additionally, the assessor prepared a two-page grid analysis with information on six comparable sales located an unknown distance from the subject although comparables #1 and #2 are in the subject's subdivision. comparables consist of a one-story with finished attic, three, part 1-story and part 1.5-story dwellings and two, 1.5-story dwellings of frame construction. The homes were built between 1930 and 1975 and range in size from 1,237 to 1,605 square feet of living area. Features include basements, four of which have finished areas, and a garage ranging in size from 240 to 720 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from August 2011 to June 2014 for prices ranging from \$110,000 to \$161,500 or from \$83 to \$114 per square foot of living area, including land, rounded.

Based on this evidence and argument, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

# 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.

Including the purchase price of the subject property, the parties submitted a total of eleven sales to support their respective positions before the Property Tax Appeal Board. The Board has given reduced weight to the subject's sale price, appellants' comparable #3 and board of review comparables #1 and #6 which properties sold in 2011 and 2012, dates more remote in time to the valuation date at issue of January 1, 2014 and therefore less likely to be indicative of the subject's estimated market value as of the assessment date.

On this record, the Board finds the best market value evidence consists of appellants' comparable sales #2 and #4 along with board of review comparable sales #2, #3, #4 and #5. The comparables have varying degrees of similarity to the subject property. These properties sold between March 2013 and June 2014 for prices ranging from \$61,600 to \$146,000 or from \$36.28 to \$97.91 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$126,742 or \$82.35 per square foot of living area, including land, is within the range of the best comparables presented and well-supported by board of review comparable #2 which is close in proximity, age, size and features to the subject dwelling.

After analyzing the properties and adjusting for differences, the Board finds that the subject's estimated market value based on its assessment appears to be justified and no reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

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. Fer	Mario Illorios
Member	Member
a R	Jerry White
Member	Acting Member
Robert 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.