



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

APPELLANT: Vijay and Manju Chahar
DOCKET NO.: 14-02517.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 04-23-128-016

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Vijay and Manju Chahar, the appellants, and the Winnebago 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 **Winnebago** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$18,211
IMPR.: \$88,039
TOTAL: \$106,250

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellants timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Winnebago 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 one-story dwelling of brick and frame exterior construction with approximately 2,709 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 2005. Features of the home include a walkout basement with finished area,¹ central air conditioning, two fireplaces and a 747 square foot garage. The property has a .7-acre site and is located in Roscoe, Roscoe Township, Winnebago County.

The appellants contend overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellants submitted information on four comparable sales in the Section V grid analysis of the Residential Appeal petition. The appellants also provided a second spreadsheet which reiterated comparable sales #1 through #4 along with listing five additional properties, one of which sold and four of which were offered for sale. The nine comparable parcels range in size from .58 of

¹ The appellants did not report any finished basement area, but the assessing officials reported 350 square feet of finished basement area which was not refuted by the appellants within any rebuttal submission.

an acre to 2.01-acres of land area which have been improved with homes that were built between 2004 and 2008; the homes range in size from 2,990 to 6,020 square feet of living area and feature basements with finished areas along with a garage. The five sales occurred between January 2014 and May 2014 for prices ranging from \$280,000 to \$364,900 or from \$83.20 to \$97.50 per square foot of living area, including land. The four listings have reported asking prices ranging from \$329,900 to \$599,000 or from \$88.80 to \$110.60 per square foot of living area, including land.

Based on this evidence, the appellants requested a total assessment of \$95,107 which would reflect a market value of approximately \$285,321 or \$105.32 per square foot of living area, including land.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$106,250. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$318,782 or \$117.68 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the 2014 three year average median level of assessment for Winnebago County of 33.33% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on five comparable sales. The comparables consist of three, one-story and two, part one-story and part two-story dwellings that were built between 2005 and 2008. The homes range in size from 2,493 and 2,876 square feet of living area. Three of the comparables have finished basement areas. The properties sold between April 2012 and May 2014 for prices ranging from \$299,500 to \$445,000 or from \$120.14 to \$178.07 per square foot of living area, including land.

Based on this evidence, 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.

The parties submitted a total of 14 suggested comparable properties to support their respective positions before the Property Tax Appeal Board. The Board has given reduced weight to appellants' comparable #2 along with board of review comparables #4 and #5 as each of these homes has a partial two-story design which differs from the subject's one-story design. The Board has also given reduced weight to appellants' comparables #6 through #9 as these dwellings are each much larger than the subject ranging in size from 3,526 to 6,020 square feet of living area as compared to the subject dwelling of 2,709 square feet of living area. The Board has also given reduced weight to board of review comparables #1, #2 and #3 as each of these sales occurred in 2012, dates more remote in time to the valuation date at issue of January 1, 2014 and thus less likely to be indicative of the subject's estimated market value.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be appellants' comparable sales #1, #3, #4 and listing #5. These most similar comparables sold or had asking prices ranging from \$280,000 to \$329,900 or from \$83.20 to \$101.70 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$318,782 or \$117.68 per square foot of living area, including land, which is within the range established by the best comparable sales in this record in terms of overall value and slightly above the range of the comparables on a per-square-foot basis which appears to be logical since the subject dwelling is smaller than these four most similar comparable dwellings. Accepted real estate valuation theory provides that all factors being equal, as the size of the property increases, the per unit value decreases. In contrast, as the size of a property decreases, the per unit value increases. Based on this evidence, 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



Member



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 23, 2016



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.