



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

APPELLANT: Yunus Kathawala  
DOCKET NO.: 21-05938.001-C-1  
PARCEL NO.: 02-1-01126-000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Yunus Kathawala, the appellant; and the Coles County Board of Review.

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

**LAND:** \$10,200  
**IMPR.:** \$32,798  
**TOTAL:** \$42,998

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**Statement of Jurisdiction**

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Coles County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2021 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 2-story apartment building of vinyl siding exterior construction with 4,296 square feet of total building area. The building was constructed in 1999 and is approximately 22 years old. Features of the building include a crawl space foundation, central air conditioning, and a 12-car garage. The building has four 2-bedroom 2-bathroom apartment units. The property has a 15,262 square foot site and is located in Charleston, Charleston Township, Coles County.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted an appraisal estimating the subject property had a market value of \$135,000 as of January 1, 2021. The appraisal was prepared by G. Daniel Corrie, a certified general real estate appraiser, for ad valorem tax purposes. The appraiser inspected the interior and exterior of the subject on February 15, 2022.

Under the income approach, the appraiser selected three rent comparables located from 0.52 of a mile to 1.44 miles from the subject. The comparables are improved with apartment buildings ranging in size from 2,400 to 5,384 square feet of total building area and are 50 or 61 years old. The comparables have from three to six 2-bedroom 1-bathroom apartment units. The comparables have monthly rents ranging from \$1,350 to \$2,550 for these comparables, which the appraiser adjusted for differences from the subject to arrive at adjusted monthly rents ranging from \$1,850 to \$2,050. The appraiser concluded market monthly rents of \$2,000 for the subject. The appraiser next selected three comparable sales with gross rent multipliers ranging from 34.21 to 61.11, from which the appraiser concluded a gross rent multiplier of 61 for the subject. Based on the foregoing, the appraiser concluded a value of \$122,000 for the subject under the income approach.

Under the sales comparison approach, the appraiser selected three comparable sales located in Charleston and from 1.12 to 2.46 miles from the subject. The parcels range in size from 7,250 to 36,155 square feet of land area and are improved with one or two 1-story apartment buildings ranging in size from 1,680 to 2,704 square feet of total building area. The buildings range in age from 48 to 65 years old. Comparables #1 and #2 each have a crawl space foundation and three or four 2-bedroom 1-bathroom apartment units. Comparable #3 has three 1-bedroom 1-bathroom apartment units. Comparable #2 also has four 1-car garages. The comparables sold from January to August 2021 for prices ranging from \$80,000 to \$113,400, or from \$35.26 to 47.62 per square foot of building area, or from \$26,667 to \$28,350 per apartment unit. The appraiser made adjustments to the comparables for differences from the subject, such as location, condition, number of units, number of bathrooms per unit, and other features and amenities, to arrive at adjusted sale prices ranging from \$127,400 to \$140,500. Based on the foregoing, the appraiser concluded a value of \$135,000 under the sales comparison approach.

The appraiser opined a market value of \$135,000 for the subject as of January 1, 2021, placing more weight on the sales comparison approach given lower rents under current market conditions.

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to reflect the appraised value conclusion.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$57,400. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$180,220, or \$41.95 per square foot of living area, or \$45,055 per apartment, land included, when using the 2021 three year average median level of assessment for Coles County of 31.85% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales located from three blocks to 11 miles from the subject. The parcels range in size from 7,000 to 12,600 square feet of land area and are improved with 2-story or 3-story apartment buildings ranging in size from 4,846 to 9,504 square feet of total building area. The buildings were constructed from 1977 to 2000. Each building has central air conditioning and from four to ten apartment units. Comparable #3 has a 528 square foot garage. The comparables sold from May 2021 to April 2022 for prices ranging from \$218,000 to \$383,800,

or from \$40.39 to \$57.33 per square foot of building area, or from \$38,250 to \$63,967 per apartment.

The board of review submitted property record cards and Real Estate Transfer Declarations for these comparables sales disclosing that comparables #1 and #2 were not advertised for sale and comparable #3 was a sale between related parties.

The board of review also submitted property record cards and Real Estate Transfer Declarations for appraisal sales #1 and #2 disclosing that appraisal sale #2 sold again in June 2022 for a price of \$190,000 and a memorandum of contract for deed and property record card for appraisal sale #1 disclosing the January 2021 sale reported by the appraiser was a contract for deed sale and includes an additional property.

Based on this evidence the board of review requested the subject's assessment be sustained.

In written rebuttal, the appellant presented a letter from the appraiser asserting that the appraisal comparables are located near the subject and are considered to be competing rental properties. The appraiser contended the appraisal sale #1 was on the market for 553 days indicting the sale price was reflective of fair market value. The appraiser further contended the board of review's comparables are located in Mattoon which is a different rental market than Charleston and is not focused on university students like Charleston. The appraiser argued the board of review's comparable #2 is part of a 16-unit complex with garages, the board of review's comparable #3 consists of two 4-unit townhouses with attached garages, and the board of review's comparable #4 is an 8-unit brick building.

### **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 met this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The appellant presented an appraisal and the board of review presented four comparable sales in support of their respective positions before the Board. The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the appraisal submitted by the appellant. The appraiser relied primarily on the sales comparison approach and selected three comparables sales of apartment buildings located in Charleston like the subject. The appraiser made appropriate adjustments to these comparables for differences from the subject, such as the comparables' one less bathroom per unit than the subject, central air conditioning amenity, and other features and amenities.

The Board gives less weight to the comparables presented by the board of review as these properties are located in Mattoon unlike the subject and three of these properties are located more than 10 miles from the subject. Moreover, the board of review presented Real Estate Transfer Declarations for these comparables which disclose that the board of review's comparables #1, #2, and #3 were not arm's length transactions.

The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$180,220, or \$41.95 per square foot of living area, or \$45,055 per apartment, land included, which is above the appraised value conclusion. The Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$135,000 as of the assessment date at issue. Since market value has been established the 2021 three year average median level of assessments for Coles County of 31.85% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue shall apply. (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(c)(1)).

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:

April 18, 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 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

Yunus Kathawala  
4113 Gandava Bend  
Austin, TX 78738

COUNTY

Coles County Board of Review  
Coles County Courthouse  
651 Jackson Avenue  
Charleston, IL 61920