

## FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT:	Christopher M. Odom & Mary K. Politsch
DOCKET NO .:	15-02134.001-R-1
PARCEL NO .:	06-28-180-020

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Christopher M. Odom & Mary K. Politsch, the appellants, by Jessica Hill-Magiera, Attorney at Law, in Lake Zurich; and the DeKalb County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented in this matter, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds <u>*A Reduction*</u> in the assessment of the property as established by the **DeKalb** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND:	\$11,666
IMPR.:	\$53,494
TOTAL:	\$65,160

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

### **Statement of Jurisdiction**

The appellants timely filed the appeal from a decision of the DeKalb 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 part two-story and part one-story dwelling of frame and vinyl exterior construction that has 2,086 square feet of living area. The dwelling was built in 2000. The home features an unfinished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a 713 square foot attached/integral garage. The subject property is located in Sycamore Township, DeKalb County, Illinois.

The appellants submitted evidence before the Property Tax Appeal Board claiming overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellants completed Section IV of the residential appeal petition. The appeal petition depicts the subject sold for \$195,500 in January 2014. The appeal petition indicates the property was sold by owner; the sale did not involve family or related corporations; and the property was advertised for sale with a sign, internet and/or auction. To corroborate the sale, the appellants submitted copies of the

Settlement Statement and Real Estate Transfer Declaration (PTAX-203) associated with the sale of the subject property. Based on this evidence, the appellants requested a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$68,627. The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$205,902 when applying the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted a letter explaining how the subject's final assessment was calculated. The board of review used 33% of the subject's 2014 sale price of \$195,500 to arrive at an assessed value of \$65,167 and then added the 2015 Sycamore Township equalization factor of 1.0531 to arrive at the final assessment of \$68,627. The Board of review did not submit any market evidence to support its assessment 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). <u>National City</u> <u>Bank of Michigan/Illinois v. Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board</u>, 331 Ill.App.3d 1038 (3<sup>rd</sup> Dist. 2002). (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 Board finds the best and only evidence of market value contained in this record is the sale of the subject property in January 2014 for \$195,500. The Board finds the subject's sale meets the fundamental elements of an arm's-length transaction. The buyer and seller were not related; the subject property was exposed to the open market; and there is no direct evidence the parties to the transaction were under duress or compelled to buy or sell. The Illinois Supreme Court has defined fair cash value as what the property would bring at a voluntary sale where the owner is ready, willing, and able to sell but not compelled to do so, and the buyer is ready, willing and able to buy but not forced to do so. Springfield Marine Bank v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 44 Ill.2d. 428, (1970). A contemporaneous sale of two parties dealing at arm's-length is not only relevant to the question of fair cash value but is practically conclusive on the issue of whether an assessment is reflective of market value. Korzen v. Belt Railway Co. of Chicago, 37 Ill.2d 158 (1967). The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$205,902, which is greater than the subject's arm's-length sale price of \$195,500. The board of review did not submit any market evidence to support its assessment of the subject property. The board of review merely explained the rational and calculations in arriving at the subject's final assessed value for the 2015 tax year, which is not credible evidence of value.

Based on this analysis, the Board finds the appellants have demonstrated the subject property is overvalued by a preponderance of the evidence contained in the record. Therefore, a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

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.

Mano Moios 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 <u>PETITION AND</u> <u>EVIDENCE</u> 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.