



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

APPELLANT: Angel Jaramillo
DOCKET NO.: 14-03930.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 06-10-329-006

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Angel Jaramillo, the appellant, by Jessica Hill-Magiera, Attorney at Law, in Lake Zurich, and the Kane County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented in this matter, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds **A Reduction** 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: \$6,469
IMPR.: \$20,195
TOTAL: \$26,664

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a 2013 Final Administrative Decision of the Property Tax Appeal Board pursuant to section 16-185 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-185) in order to challenge 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 exterior construction with 1,812 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1989. Features of the home include a partial basement, central air conditioning and a detached 360 square foot garage. The property has a 6,600 square foot site and is located in Elgin, Elgin Township, Kane County.

The subject property is an owner occupied residence that was the subject matter of an appeal before the Property Tax Appeal Board the prior year under Docket Number 13-02375.001-R-1. In that appeal the Property Tax Appeal Board rendered a decision lowering the assessment of the subject property to \$26,664 based on the evidence submitted by the parties. The appellant based this appeal on a contention of law and asserted that the subject property is owner occupied such that, in accordance with Section 16-185 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-185), the 2013 assessment determination of the Property Tax Appeal Board should be carried forward to

tax year 2014 as both 2013 and 2014 are in the same general assessment cycle in Kane County. (See 35 ILCS 200/9-215).

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to \$26,664.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$44,626. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of approximately \$134,052 or \$73.98 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the three year average level of assessment in Kane County 33.29% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In response to the appeal, the board of review contended that the subject property's "condition has changed since its purchase" and submitted a memorandum prepared by the Elgin Township Assessor's Office along with additional data. The assessor argued that at the time of the 2013 sale, the subject was in "need of repairs such as wall, door, kitchen, and bath repairs and new flooring was needed." There were also no appliances at the time of sale and the buyer was assuming any existing city code violations. As such, the assessor opines that the lower sale price was reflective of the condition of the property.

Since the time of sale and based upon a visual drive-by inspection, the home is now being occupied. The assessor next asserts:

Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that, because of the disclosed code violations that existed at the time of purchase, repairs have been made and the condition of the property has changed to be in at least average condition.

As such, the assessor opined that the prior 2013 decision may have been appropriate at the time of sale due to condition, "this same value that the appellant is requesting to rollover for 2014 is no longer accurate or equitable due to the Assessor's evidence, the property being occupied and its change in condition."

The township assessor also submitted a copy of the subject's property record card which depicts the address of the subject property and that the "billing" address is the same as the subject property while also naming the appellant as the person to be billed.

Furthermore, the assessor submitted a grid analysis of eight comparable sales. The comparables consist of one-story frame, brick or frame and brick dwellings that were built between 1951 and 1978. The homes range in size from 1,223 to 1,804 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a basement, six of which have finished area. Seven of the comparables have central air conditioning and three of the comparables each have one or two fireplaces. Each of the comparables also has a garage ranging in size from 280 to 529 square feet of building area. The properties sold between February 2012 and September 2014 for prices ranging from \$120,000 to \$150,000 or from \$81.49 to \$104.66 per square foot of living area, including land.

In closing in the memorandum, the assessor stated, "The subject is no longer in the same condition as it was when it was purchased and therefore should no longer be valued based on its sale price. It should now be valued based on sales of similar homes in the same condition."

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

In written rebuttal, counsel for the appellant noted that the board of review did not dispute the appellant's contention that the subject is owner-occupied residential real estate subject to application of Section 16-185 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-185).

Conclusion of Law

The subject property was the subject matter of an appeal before the Property Tax Appeal Board the prior year under Docket Number 13-02375.001-R-1. In that appeal the Property Tax Appeal Board rendered a decision lowering the assessment of the subject property to \$26,664 based on the evidence submitted by the parties.

The appellant's appeal is based upon a contention of law with citation to a single provision of the Code. Section 10-15 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5-ILCS 100/10-15) provides:

Standard of proof. Unless otherwise provided by law or stated in the agency's rules, the standard of proof in any contested case hearing conducted under this Act by an agency shall be the preponderance of the evidence.

The rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board are silent with respect to the burden of proof associated with an argument founded on a contention of law. See 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63. The appellant in this appeal relied upon Section 16-185 of the Code (35 ILCS 200/16-185) which provides in pertinent part:

If the Property Tax Appeal Board renders a decision lowering the assessment of a particular parcel on which a residence occupied by the owner is situated, such reduced assessment, subject to equalization, **shall** remain in effect for the remainder of the general assessment period as provided in Sections 9-215 through 9-225, unless that parcel is subsequently sold in an arm's length transaction establishing a fair cash value for the parcel that is different from the fair cash value on which the Board's assessment is based, or unless the decision of the Property Tax Appeal Board is reversed or modified upon review. [Emphasis added.]

The board of review did not dispute that the subject property is an owner occupied dwelling. The Board finds on this record that the prior year's decision should be carried forward to the subsequent year pursuant to section 16-185 of the Code (35 ILCS 200/16-185) and the fact that 2013 and 2014 are within the same general assessment period in Kane County. The record contains no evidence indicating that the assessment year in question is in a different general assessment period. The record also contains no evidence indicating that the subject property sold subsequent to the 2013 tax year determination in an arm's length transaction. Moreover, in light

of the terms of Section 16-185 of the Code, the Board has given no consideration to the comparable sales data submitted by the assessing officials or the contention that the condition of the subject property has been improved since the date of the sale transaction. There is no provision within Section 16-185 calling for a change in the assessment of owner-occupied residential real estate "unless that parcel is subsequently sold in an arm's length transaction establishing a fair cash value for the parcel that is different from the fair cash value on which the Board's assessment is based, or unless the decision of the Property Tax Appeal Board is reversed or modified upon review." There was no evidence of the sale of the subject property and there was no evidence that the decision of the Board was reversed or modified upon review.

Moreover, Section 10-20 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/10-20) provides that maintenance and repairs to a structure shall not increase the assessed valuation unless the change increases the square footage, materially alters the character and condition of the structure, goes beyond merely prolonging the life of the existing structure or used materials that were greater in value than the replacement value of the materials being replaced. There is no indication in the arguments presented by the board of review that the change in condition, in light of the statutory provision, was anything more than merely restoring the structure from a state of disrepair. Furthermore, to the extent that the changes did materially alter the property, the assessing officials provided no evidence in the form of building permits or costs of repair to substantiate what impact the repairs had on the value of the subject property.

For these reasons and due to the provisions of Section 16-185 of the Code, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted commensurate with the appellant's request.

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: _____

February 24, 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.