



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

APPELLANT: Michael Kronk
DOCKET NO.: 15-01438.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 05-25-326-002

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Michael Kronk, the appellant, by attorney Joanne Elliott, of Elliott & Associates, P.C. in Des Plaines; and the Kane 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 **Kane** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$25,000
IMPR.: \$113,439
TOTAL: \$138,439

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant 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 one-story dwelling of frame and masonry construction with 1,965 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 2008. Features of the home include a full finished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a two-car garage. The property has a 7,405 square foot or 0.17 of an acre site and is located in Elgin, Plato Township, Kane County.

The appellant contends assessment inequity and overvaluation as the bases of the appeal. In support of the inequity argument, the appellant submitted information on three equity comparables located in the same neighborhood as the subject property. The comparables have either 5,227 or 5,663 square foot of land area. The comparables are improved with one-story dwellings of frame and masonry construction. The dwellings were constructed from 2007 to 2014. The dwellings range in size from 1,863 to 1,968 square feet of living area. Each

comparable has a full unfinished basement and a two-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$78,823 to \$90,838 or from \$42.31 to \$46.16 per square foot of living area. Based on the equity evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's total assessment to \$111,715.

In support of the overvaluation argument, the appellant submitted three comparable sales located in the same neighborhood as the subject property. The comparables sold from December 2012 to August 2014 for prices that ranged from \$286,500 to \$408,285 or from \$155.71 to \$207.21 per square foot of living area, land included. The comparables have either 5,227 or 12,600 square foot of land area. The comparables have dwellings that were described as one-story dwellings of frame and masonry construction; however, the appellant submitted evidence indicating comparable sale #2 is actually a two-story dwelling. The dwellings were constructed from 2006 to 2013. The dwellings range in size from 1,840 to 2,490 square feet of living area. The comparables have two-car garages and full basements, one of which is finished. The appellant also submitted data sheets from the Multiple Listing Service for two of the three comparable sales. Based on the market evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's total assessment to \$115,026.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$138,439. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$113,439 or \$57.73 per square foot of living area. The subject's total assessment reflects a market value of \$415,608 or \$211.05 per square foot of living area, 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 ten properties located in the same neighborhood as the subject. Comparables #1 through #3 are actually the appellant's comparable sales; comparables #4 through #6 are the board of review's equity evidence; and comparables #7 through #10 are the board of review's market value evidence. The board of review's equity evidence, comparables #4 through #6, are improved with one-story dwellings of frame and masonry construction. The dwellings were constructed in 2011. The dwellings range in size from 1,885 to 1,990 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a full finished basement and a two-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$107,742 to \$114,820 or from \$57.16 to \$58.23 per square foot of living area.

The board of review's market evidence, comparables #7 through #10, are situated on sites containing from 0.12 to 0.16 of an acre of land area. The comparables consist of one-story dwellings of frame and masonry construction. The dwellings were constructed in 2014 or 2015. The dwellings range in size from 1,841 to 1,994 square feet of living area. The comparables have full basements and two-car garages. The comparables sold from April 2014 to January 2015 for prices that ranged from \$390,371 to \$442,178 or from \$198.86 to \$231.39 per square foot of living area, land included.

The appellant's attorney submitted a rebuttal to the board of review's evidence. Counsel argued that the board of review submitted market evidence that consisted of "new construction sales" without any documentary evidence to confirm the sales were actually arm's length transactions.

Conclusion of Law

The appellant contends in part that 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 based on overvaluation is not warranted.

The parties presented sale prices for six comparable properties. The Board finds that the appellant's comparable sales #2 and #3 were dated. These comparables sold in December 2012 and September 2013, respectively, and were not proximate to the January 1, 2015 assessment date. Moreover, the appellant's comparable #3 was shown to be a two-story dwelling with considerably more living area than the subject. As a result, the Board gave little weight to these comparable sales. The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the appellant's comparable sale #1 and board of review comparables #7 through #10. The Board finds these comparables were very similar to the subject in nearly all characteristics with the appellant's comparable sale #1 being most similar in age. The Board finds these properties sold more proximate to the January 1, 2015 assessment date. These five comparables sold from April 2014 to January 2015 for prices that ranged from \$286,500 to \$442,178 or from \$153.78 to \$231.39 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$415,608 or \$211.05 per square foot of living area, including land, falls within the range established by the best comparable sales in this record. Based on this evidence, the Board finds a reduction in the subject's assessment based on overvaluation is not justified.

Alternatively, the appellant contents assessment inequity as a basis of this appeal. When unequal treatment in the assessment process is the basis of the appeal, the inequity of the assessments must be proved by clear and convincing evidence. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). Proof of unequal treatment in the assessment process should consist of documentation of the assessments for the assessment year in question of not less than three comparable properties showing the similarity, proximity and lack of distinguishing characteristics of the assessment comparables to the subject property. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(b). The Board finds the appellant did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment based on inequity is not warranted.

The parties submitted information on a total of six suggested equity comparables. The Board finds that all of the equity comparables were similar to the subject in almost all characteristics. The Board finds the six comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$42.31 to \$58.23 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$57.73 per square foot of living area falls near the higher end of the range established by the equity comparables in this record. The Board finds the subject's improvement assessment appears justified, because the comparables at the higher end of this range had full finished basements like the subject. Based on this record, the Board finds the appellant was not able to demonstrate with clear and convincing evidence that the subject's improvement was inequitably assessed and a reduction in the subject's assessment based on inequity 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



Acting 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: June 23, 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.