

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANTS:	Ganesh & Hema Subramanian
DOCKET NO.:	20-05591.001-R-1
PARCEL NO .:	09-24-478-080

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Ganesh & Hema Subramanian, the appellants, by Jessica Hill-Magiera, Attorney at Law in Lake Zurich; and the Kane County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented in this matter, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds <u>No Change</u> 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:	\$23,674
IMPR.:	\$77,454
TOTAL:	\$101,128

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellants 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 2020 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 townhouse of brick and frame exterior construction with 1,789 square feet of living area.¹ The dwelling was constructed in 1997. Features of the home include a basement with 1,085 square feet of finished area, central air conditioning, a fireplace, 3.5 baths, and a 400 square foot garage. The property has a 2,483 square foot site and is located in St. Charles, St. Charles Township, Kane County.

The appellants contend overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellants submitted information on four comparable sales located within .11 of a mile from the subject. The comparables consist of two-story townhouses that were built in 1997 or 1998. The dwellings range in size from 1,755 to 1,815. The comparables each have a basement, central air conditioning, 2.5 baths, a fireplace and a 400 or 453 square foot garage. The comparables sold

¹ The Board finds the best description of the subject property was the board of review's evidence.

from January 2019 to May 2020 for prices ranging from \$265,000 to \$285,000 or from \$151.00 to \$158.16 per square foot of living area, including land. 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 \$101,128. The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$303,505 or \$169.65 per square foot of living area, including land, when applying the 2019 three-year average median level of assessment for Kane County of 33.32%.

In response to the appeal, the board of review submitted a grid analysis that reiterated the appellants' comparable sales that was prepared by the township assessor.² The assessor's grid analysis disclosed the appellants' comparables have sites ranging in size from 2,091 to 2,483 square feet of land area. The comparable have brick and frame exteriors and two comparables have finished basement area.

In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review through the township assessor submitted a grid analysis on four comparable sales located within the same subdivision as the subject. The comparables consist of two-story townhouses of brick and frame exterior construction that were built in 1996 or 1997. The dwellings range in size from 1,564 to 1,802 square feet of living area and are situated on sites with either 2,091 or 2,483 square feet of land area. Each comparable has central air conditioning, one fireplace, 2.5 or 3.5 baths, and a 400 square foot garage. The comparables sold from March 2017 to February 2020 for prices ranging from \$267,500 to \$277,000 or from \$151.52 to \$175.83 per square foot of living area, including land.

The board of review asserted the subject's assessment is fair when considering adjustments to the comparables for the subject's extra bath and/or finished basement area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requests confirmation of the subject's assessment.

In rebuttal, the appellants' counsel argued the county comparable sales are not comparable as sale #1 is 12% smaller in dwelling size and sales #2, #3 and #4 were remote sales in 2017 and 2018.

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). 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 did not meet this burden of proof and no reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The record contains nine comparable sales for the Board's consideration. The Board gives less weight to board of review comparables #2, #3 and #4 as they sold from March 2017 to June 2018

 $^{^{2}}$ The assessors' grid analysis of the appellants' comparables provided an additional comparable sale that was not part of the appellants' record and will not be further considered in this analysis.

which were less proximate in time to the January 1, 2020 assessment date than the other sales in the record.

The Board finds the best evidence of the market value to be board of review comparable #1 and the appellants' comparables. These comparables sold proximate in time to the assessment date at issue and are relatively similar to the subject in location, age, dwelling size and some features. However, each comparable has one less full bath and less finished basement area when compared to the subject. Nevertheless, these comparables sold from January 2019 to May 2020 for prices ranging from \$265,000 to \$285,000 or from \$151.00 to \$175.83 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$303,505 or \$169.65 per square foot of living area, including land, which falls within the range established by the best comparable sales in this record on a price per square foot basis but higher than the range on overall market value. The subject's higher overall value is logical due to subject's extra full bath and additional finished basement area. 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 and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not 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:

May 16, 2023

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 <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 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

Ganesh & Hema Subramanian, by attorney: Jessica Hill-Magiera Attorney at Law 790 Harvest Drive Lake Zurich, IL 60047

COUNTY

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