



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

APPELLANT: Paul Hanko
DOCKET NO.: 15-00529.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 14-12-17-314-001-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Paul Hanko, the appellant, by attorney William I. Sandrick of Sandrick Law Firm LLC in South Holland; and the Will 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 **Will County Board of Review** is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$15,350
IMPR.: \$58,350
TOTAL: \$73,700

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Will County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2015 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 is improved with a two-story dwelling of frame construction with 3,765 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 2005 and is approximately 11 years old. Features of the home include an unfinished basement, central air conditioning and an integral two-car garage with 403 square feet of building area. The property has a 12,092 square foot site and is located in Manhattan, Manhattan Township, Will County.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted an appraisal estimating the subject property had a market value of \$170,000 as of January 1, 2013. The appraisal was prepared by Eric Slakcik, a certified general real estate appraiser. In estimating the market value of the subject property the appraiser developed the cost approach to value and the sales comparison approach to value. Under the cost approach the appraiser arrived at an estimated market value of \$176,600.

In developing the sales comparison approach to value the appraiser used three comparable sales improved with two-story dwellings that ranged in size from 2,988 to 3,747 square feet of living area. The dwellings were seven or nine years old. Each comparable has a full unfinished basement, central air conditioning and a two-car garage. Two comparables each had one fireplace. The sales occurred from January 2012 to January 2013 for prices ranging from \$170,000 to \$177,500 or from \$46.04 to \$56.89 per square foot of living area, including land. The appraiser made adjustments to the comparables for differences from the subject to arrive at adjusted prices ranging from \$168,500 to \$176,000. The appraiser gave most weight to the sales comparison approach to value to arrive at an estimated market value of \$170,000 as of January 1, 2013. Based on this evidence the appellant requested the subject's assessment be reduced to \$56,661.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$73,700. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$221,654 or \$58.87 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the 2015 three year average median level of assessment for Will County of 33.25% 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 identified by the Manhattan Township Assessor. The comparables were improved with two-story dwellings of frame construction that ranged in size from 3,010 to 3,620 square feet of living area. The dwellings were either eleven or thirteen years old. Four comparables have basements, one comparable has a crawl space foundation, each comparable has central air conditioning, one comparable has a fireplace and each comparable has a garage ranging in size from 380 to 504 square feet of building area. The comparable sales were located in the same subdivision as the subject property. The sales occurred from December 2013 to January 2015 for prices ranging from \$235,000 to \$277,500 or from \$68.21 to \$86.38 per square foot of living area, including land. The board of review requested no change be made to 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 did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the comparable sales submitted by the board of review. These comparables were similar to the subject in location, age, style and features. The board of review sales also occurred proximate in time to the assessment date at issue. The board of review comparable sales sold for prices ranging from \$235,000 to \$277,500 or from \$68.21 to \$86.38 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$221,654 or \$58.87 per square foot of living area, including land, which is below the range established by the best comparable sales in the record. Less weight

was given the appellant's appraisal as the report had an effective date two years prior to the assessment date at issue and the sales used in the report occurred from two to three years prior to the assessment date at issue. Based on this evidence the Board finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is not justified.

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.