



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

APPELLANT: Padmaja Singireddy
DOCKET NO.: 17-00268.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 03-07-130-002

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Padmaja Singireddy, the appellant, by attorney Laura Godek of Laura Moore Godek, PC in McHenry; 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: \$19,702
IMPR.: \$96,333
TOTAL: \$116,035

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 2017 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 two-story dwelling of brick and frame exterior construction with 3,111 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 2006. Features of the home include an unfinished look-out style basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a three-car garage with 630 square feet of building area. The property has a 9,583 square foot site and is located in Carpentersville, Dundee Township, Kane County.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted an appraisal with an estimated market value of \$305,000 as of January 1, 2016. The appraisal was prepared by Jerzy Siudyla, a State of Illinois certified residential real estate appraiser. The property rights appraised were fee simple and the appraisal was performed to evaluate the retrospective market value of the subject property for tax purposes only. In

estimating the market value of the subject property, the appraiser developed the sales comparison approach to value.

Under the sales comparison approach to value the appraiser utilized four comparable sales located in Carpentersville within .36 of a mile of the subject property to estimate the market value. The parcels range in size from 10,019 to 13,939 square feet of land area and have been improved with two-story dwellings of brick and frame exterior construction that range in age from 1 to 10 years old. The homes range in size from 2,568 to 3,440 square feet of living area and feature unfinished basements, central air conditioning and two-car or three-car garages. The comparables sold from April 2015 to December 2015 for prices ranging from \$275,000 to \$345,000 or from \$90.97 to \$107.09 per square foot of living area, including land. The appraiser made adjustments for differences in sales or financing concessions, land area, view, dwelling size, age, condition and/or other amenities. After making adjustments to the comparables for differences from the subject the appraiser estimated the comparables had adjusted prices ranging from \$298,194 to \$310,000. Based on this data the appraiser estimated the subject had an estimated market value of \$305,000 as of January 1, 2016.

Based on this evidence, the appellant 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 \$116,035. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$348,244 or \$111.94 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the 2017 three-year average median level of assessment for Kane County of 33.32% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

The board of review submitted a letter from the Dundee Township Assessor's Office along with additional data.¹ The assessor critiqued the adjustments in the appellant's appraisal.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment of the subject property, the board of review provided information on eight comparable sales located within .44 miles of the subject property and in the same subdivision as the subject. The comparables are improved with two-story dwellings of brick and frame exterior construction containing either 3,035 or 3,133 square feet of living area. The dwellings were constructed from 2006 to 2012. The comparables each feature a basement with three having finished area and two having a look-out style. The comparables each have central air conditioning, a fireplace and a 630 square foot garage. The comparables have sites ranging in size from 9,583 or 13,939 square feet of land area. The comparables sold from January 2015 to July 2017 for prices ranging from \$333,000 to \$370,000 or from \$109.61 to \$120.43 per square foot of living area, including land.

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

In written rebuttal, counsel for the appellant critiqued the board of review evidence.

¹ The board of review submitted a grid analysis labeled "Appellant and Appraisal Sale Comparables". However, the Board finds the appellant's evidence consisted of an appraisal and did not include comparable sales as part of the record. Therefore, the Board gives no weight to the appellant sale comparables grid analysis submitted by the board of review.

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 no reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The appellant submitted an appraisal estimating the subject property had a market value of \$305,000 as of January 1, 2016. The Board gave little weight to the appraisal report. The effective date of the appraisal was one year prior to the subject's assessment date. Moreover, the comparable sales contained within the appraisal occurred in 2015, which are dated and less indicative of market value as of the subject's January 1, 2017 assessment date. The Board finds the appraiser's value conclusion is not credible because there were other sales of more similar two-story dwellings when compared to the subject that were located in the subject's subdivision that were not used by the appraiser. Furthermore, the appraiser used a short sale which calls into question the arms-length nature of the transaction and also the predominate sales in the record were not short sales.

The board of review submitted eight comparable sales for the Board's consideration. The Board gave less to the 2015 sale dates of board of review comparables #1 and #2, which are dated and less likely to reflect the subject's market value as of the January 1, 2017 assessment date. The Board also gave less weight to board of review comparables #5 and #8 that have a superior finished basement feature when compared to the subject.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value in the record to be comparables #3, #4, #6 and #7 submitted by the board of review. These four comparables were most similar to the subject in location, dwelling size, design, age and features. The comparables sold from April 2016 to July 2017 for prices ranging from \$333,000 to \$365,500 or from \$109.61 to \$120.43 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$348,244 or \$111.94 per square foot of living area, including land, which is within the range established by the best comparable sales in this record. After considering adjustments to the comparables for differences when compared to the subject, the Board finds the subject's estimated market value as reflected by its assessment is supported. Therefore, no 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. Pursuant to Section 1910.50(d) of the rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(d)) the proceeding before the Property Tax Appeal Board is terminated when the decision is rendered. The Property Tax Appeal Board does not require any motion or request for reconsideration.

Chairman



Member

Member



Member

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: September 17, 2019



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 or years of the same general assessment period, as provided in Sections 9-125 through 9-225, 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 such subsequent year or years 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 OR YEARS. A separate petition and evidence must be filed for each of the remaining years of the general assessment period.

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.

PARTIES OF RECORD

AGENCY

State of Illinois
Property Tax Appeal Board
William G. Stratton Building, Room 402
401 South Spring Street
Springfield, IL 62706-4001

APPELLANT

Padmaja Singireddy , by attorney:
Laura Godek
Laura Moore Godek, PC
913 North Curran Road
McHenry, IL 60050

COUNTY

Kane County Board of Review
Kane County Government Center
719 Batavia Ave., Bldg. C, 3rd Fl.
Geneva, IL 60134