



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

APPELLANT: Austin Holdings, Timothy Ramseyer & Patrick Koziol
DOCKET NO.: 15-01414.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 06-14-126-013

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Austin Holdings, Timothy Ramseyer & Patrick Koziol, the appellants, 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: \$10,736
IMPR.: \$6,596
TOTAL: \$17,332

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 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 consists of a 2-story dwelling of frame construction containing 1,634 square feet of living area divided into two apartment units. The dwelling was constructed in 1893 and features a full unfinished basement. The property has a 9,108 square foot site and is located in Elgin, Elgin Township, Kane County.

The appellant's appeal is based on overvaluation. In support of this argument the appellants completed Section IV - Recent Sale Data of the appeal and submitted a Settlement Statement disclosing the subject property was purchased on June 2, 2014 for a price of \$52,000 or \$26,000 per apartment unit, including land. The subject was purchased from SFR 2012-1 Chicago LLC, the sale was handled by a realtor and the sale was not between family or related corporations. The appellants disclosed that the property was advertised through the Multiple Listing Service (MLS) and submitted an MLS Listing Sheet indicating the subject was on the market 55 days

and was an REO/Lender Owned property. Based on this evidence, the appellants requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to reflect the purchase price.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$34,903. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$104,782 or \$52,391 per apartment unit, land included, when using the 2015 three-year average median level of assessment for Kane County of 33.31% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on 17 comparable sales. The comparables had varying degrees of similarity when compared to the subject. They are described as 1, 1½ and/or 2-story dwellings of frame and/or masonry construction built between 1870 and 1987 and ranging in size from 1,119 to 2,714 square feet of living area. Each has two apartment units. These comparables sold between May 2013 and March 2015 for prices ranging from \$106,000 to \$175,000 or from \$53,000 to \$87,500 per square foot of living area land included.

In rebuttal, the appellants' counsel claims the board of review does not dispute the recent sale of the subject, nor does it provide any evidence that the recent sale was not valid.

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 met this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The appellants provided evidence that the subject property sold in June 2014 for a price of \$52,000 or \$26,000 per apartment unit, including land. The Board finds the appellants provided evidence demonstrating the sale had elements of an arm's length transaction. The appellants completed Section IV - Recent Sale Data of the appeal and submitted a Settlement Statement and an MLS Listing Sheet disclosing the property was purchased from a lending institution, the parties to the transaction were not related, the property was sold using a realtor, the property had been advertised through MLS and was on the market 55 days. The Board gave less weight to the comparable sales submitted by the board of review. Although these comparables have some similarities with the subject, they do not overcome the subject's arm's-length sale price. Therefore, the Board finds the best evidence of market value is the subject's sale in June 2014 for a price of \$52,000. The Board finds the purchase price is below the market value reflected by the assessment and the board of review did not present any substantive evidence to challenge the arm's length nature of the transaction or to refute the contention that the purchase price was reflective of market value. Therefore, a reduction in the subject's assessment commensurate with the appellants' request is warranted.

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.