



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

APPELLANT: Nicole Kamba
DOCKET NO.: 17-32686.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 18-11-200-047-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Nicole Kamba, the appellant, by attorney George N. Reveliotis of Reveliotis Law, P.C. in Park Ridge; and the Cook 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 **Cook** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$1,300
IMPR.: \$22,681
TOTAL: \$23,981

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Cook 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 multi-level dwelling of masonry exterior construction with 1,652 square feet of living area.¹ The dwelling is approximately 55 years old. Features of the home include a partial basement with finished area and a two-car garage. The property has an approximately 3,060 square foot site and is located in McCook, Lyons Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-34 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased by KJS Properties,

¹ The appellant's appraiser described the subject dwelling as a split-level design with 1,472 square feet of living area, while the board of review evidence and photo depicts the subject dwelling as a multi-level dwelling with 1,652 square feet of living area, which was unrefuted by the appellant.

LLC on February 16, 2014 for a price of \$97,000. The appellant indicated on the appeal that the sellers were Herculano and Oto Munioz and that the parties to the transaction were not related. The appellant further indicated the property was sold by the owner, the property had been listed for sale with the Multiple Listing Service (MLS) and the property had been marketed for 261 days. To document the transaction, the appellant provided copies of the listing sheet, Bill of Sale and Settlement Statement. The Settlement Statement depicts the borrower as KJS Properties, LLC with a settlement date of May 9, 2014 and indicated the sale was a cash transaction and further disclosed there were no commissions paid.

The record also contains a copy of a Quit Claim Deed dated August 14, 2016, identifying KJS Properties, LLC as the grantor and the grantee as NTK Grand LLC. Additionally, the record contains a Quit Claim Deed dated November 14, 2014, identifying the grantor as NTK Grand LLC and the grantee as Nicole Kamba, the appellant. The appellant also submitted a copy of the PTAX-203 Illinois Real Estate Transfer Declaration associated with the November 2014 transaction noting the property was transferred by Quit Claim Deed from NTK Grand LLC to Nicole Kamba. The transfer declaration disclosed that no consideration was associated with the November 2014 property transfer. A letter dated November 25, 2014, purportedly from Khalid Siddiqui, Owner Manager of KJS Properties, LLC, indicated that the KJS Properties, LLC was just a transfer means for Nicole Kamba to purchase 4908 Grand Ave, McCook, IL, which is the subject property.

In further support of the overvaluation argument, the appellant submitted an Exterior-Only Inspection Residential Appraisal Report prepared by William Grba, a Certified Real Estate Appraiser. The purpose of the appraisal was to estimate the market value for a refinance transaction. The lender/client was Fifth Thirs-ACAPS. 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 used five comparables sales and two listing described as split-level, ranch or Cape Cod dwellings ranging in size from 1,008 to 1,866 square feet of living area and are located within .87 of a mile of the subject property. The comparables range in age from 36 to 61 years old. Four comparables each feature a basement with two having finished area, five comparables have central air conditioning, four comparables each have a fireplace and each comparable has a one-car or a two-car garage. The comparables have sites ranging in size from 5,400 to 9,791 square feet of land area. Comparables #1 through #3 and #6 sold from January 2013 to November 2014 for prices ranging from \$131,500 to \$155,000 or from \$90.70 to \$130.46 per square foot of living area, including land. Comparables #4 and #5 are listed for \$139,900 and \$175,000 or \$138.79 and \$93.78 per square foot of living area, including land, respectively. After considering adjustments to the comparables for differences when compared to the subject, the appraiser arrived at an estimated market value of \$136,000 as of December 9, 2014.

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested that the subject's total assessment be reduced to \$11,650. The requested assessment would reflect a total market value of \$116,500 or \$70.52 per square foot of living area using 1,652, land included, when applying the level of assessment for class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance of 10%. The assessment request appears to be the average of the February 16, 2014 purchase price and the appraised value.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$23,981. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$239,810 or \$145.16 per square foot of living area, including land, when using the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance level of assessment for class 2 property of 10%.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales, two of which are located within the subject's neighborhood code. The comparables have sites that range in size from 6,600 to 10,725 square feet of land area. The comparables are improved with multi-level dwellings of masonry or frame and masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 1,288 to 2,931 square feet of living area. Each comparable features a partial basement with finished area. Three comparables have central air conditioning, three comparables each have one fireplace and each comparable has a two-car garage. The comparables sold from April 2014 to September 2017 for prices ranging from \$203,500 to \$665,000 or from \$114.13 to \$310.33 per square foot of living area, land included. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

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 a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The appellant provided evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased in May 2014 for a price of \$97,000. The Board gives little weight to the subject's sale in May 2014 which is dated and less likely to be indicative of the subject's market value as of the January 1, 2017 assessment date. Furthermore, the May 2014 settlement statement depicts the buyer as KJS Properties, LLC, not the appellant, and no commissions were paid. The subject property subsequently transferred to the appellant through a series of Quit Claim deeds.

The record also contains an appraisal submitted by the appellant and four comparable sales submitted by the board of review. The Board gives little weight to the appellant's appraisal report as the effective date of the appraisal was December 9, 2014, which is two years prior to the subject's assessment date. The appraisal was an exterior only report. Moreover, the comparable sales contained within the appraisal occurred in 2013 and 2014, which are dated and less indicative of market value as of the assessment date at issue. All of the comparables are dissimilar to the subject in design and four comparables differ from the subject in dwelling size. These factors undermine the credibility of the appraisal's final value conclusion.

As to the board of review comparable sales, the Board give less weight to comparables #2, #3 and #4 which differ from the subject in dwelling size, age or sold in 2014 which is dated and less likely to be indicative of market value as of the January 1, 2017 assessment date.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be board of review comparable sale #1. The Board finds this comparable to be most similar to the subject in design, age and features, though it has a larger site size and a smaller dwelling size. This property sold in November 2016 for \$399,700 or \$310.33 per square foot living area including land. The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$239,810 or \$145.16 per square foot of living area including land, which is less than the most similar comparable sale contained in the record. After considering adjustment to this comparable for differences when compared to the subject, like site size, dwelling size and features, the Board finds the subject's estimated market value as reflected by its assessment is supported and no reduction 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: March 16, 2021



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

Nicole Kamba, by attorney:
George N. Reveliotis
Reveliotis Law, P.C.
1030 Higgins Road
Suite 101
Park Ridge, IL 60068

COUNTY

Cook County Board of Review
County Building, Room 601
118 North Clark Street
Chicago, IL 60602