



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

APPELLANT: AMH 2014 2
DOCKET NO.: 17-00378.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 15-25-329-004

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are AMH 2014 2, the appellant, by attorney Michael R. Davies of Ryan Law LLP in Chicago; 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: \$10,334
IMPR.: \$60,549
TOTAL: \$70,883

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 Marigold model, part two-story and part one-story dwelling of frame exterior construction with 2,002 square feet of living area.¹ The dwelling was constructed in 2005. Features of the home include a slab foundation, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a 460 square foot garage. The property has a 8,276 square foot site and is located in Aurora, Aurora Township, Kane County.

The appellant contends assessment inequity as the basis of the appeal. The subject's land assessment was not contested. In support of the inequity argument, the appellant submitted information on three assessment comparables located within .09 of a mile of the subject

¹ Appellant's attorney provided limited information regarding the features of both the subject property and the comparables. Additional descriptive details about the subject were submitted by the board of review.

property.² The comparables were improved with a Marigold model, part two-story and part one story and two, Blue Aster model, one-story dwellings of frame exterior construction containing either 1,546 or 2,002 square feet of living area. The dwellings were constructed in 2004 or 2005. The comparables feature central air conditioning and garages containing 400 or 460 square feet of building area. Additionally, one comparable has a basement. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$48,953 to \$62,517 or from \$31.23 to \$31.78 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's building assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$70,883. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$60,549 or \$30.24 per square foot of living area.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted three sales comparables and three equity comparables. The sales comparables are located within .52 of a mile of the subject property. The comparables have varying degrees of similarity to the subject. The comparables sold from January 2015 to July 2016 for prices ranging from \$215,000 to \$225,000 or from \$87.72 to \$115.67 per square foot of living area, including land. The equity comparables are located within .27 of a mile of the subject property. The comparables were improved with Marigold model, part two-story and part one-story dwellings of frame exterior construction containing 2,002 square feet of living area. The dwellings were constructed in 2004 or 2005. The comparables feature central air conditioning and garages ranging in size from 460 to 636 square feet of building area. In addition, two comparables have fireplaces. The comparables have improvement assessments of \$60,222 and \$60,549 or \$30.08 and \$30.24 per square feet of living area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

Conclusion of Law

The appellant contends assessment inequity as the basis of the 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 no reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The Board gave no weight to the sales comparables submitted by the board of review as this evidence does not address the appellant's equity argument. The parties submitted six suggested equity comparables for the Board's consideration. The Board gave less weight to the appellant's comparable #1 due to its superior basement foundation, along with comparables #2 and #3 due to their dissimilar designs and smaller dwelling sizes when compared to the subject.

² The appellant's grid analysis was void of some pertinent descriptive data, which was drawn from the evidence provided by the board of review.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be the comparables submitted by the board of review. These comparables have the same Marigold model home as the subject property and are most similar in location, dwelling size, design, age and features when compared to the subject. These comparables have improvement assessments of \$60,222 and \$60,549 or \$30.08 and \$30.24 per square foot of living area. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$60,549 or \$30.24 per square foot of living area, which is supported by the most similar comparables in this record. After considering adjustments to the comparables for differences when compared to the subject, the Board finds the evidence demonstrates the subject's improvement assessment is justified.

The constitutional provision for uniformity of taxation and valuation does not require mathematical equality. The requirement is satisfied if the intent is evident to adjust the burden with a reasonable degree of uniformity and if such is the effect of the statute enacted by the General Assembly establishing the method of assessing real property in its general operation. A practical uniformity, rather than an absolute one, is the test. Apex Motor Fuel Co. v. Barrett, 20 Ill.2d 395 (1960). Although the comparables presented by the parties disclosed that properties located in the same area are not assessed at identical levels, all that the constitution requires is a practical uniformity, which appears to exist on the basis of the evidence presented.

Based on this record the Board finds the appellant did not demonstrate with clear and convincing evidence that the subject's improvement was inequitably assessed and no reduction in the subject's assessment is 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. 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: July 16, 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

AMH 2014 2, by attorney:
Michael R. Davies
Ryan Law LLP
311 South Wacker Drive
Mailbox #29
Chicago, IL 60606

COUNTY

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