



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

APPELLANT: Michael & Marion Coco
DOCKET NO.: 22-01287.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 12-29-102-005

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Michael & Marion Coco, the appellants, by attorney George N. Reveliotis, of Reveliotis Law, P.C. in Park Ridge; 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: \$69,807
IMPR.: \$262,441
TOTAL: \$332,248

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 2022 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 dwelling of brick and frame exterior construction with 4,549 square feet of living area.¹ The dwelling was constructed in 2006. Features of the home include a basement with finished area, central air conditioning, a fireplace, a 3-car garage, and an inground swimming pool. The property has a 42,141 square foot site and is located in Batavia, Batavia Township, Kane County.

The appellants contend overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellants submitted information on six comparable sales² located within the same assessment

¹ The parties differ regarding the subject's dwelling size. The Board finds the best evidence of dwelling size is found in the subject's property record card presented by the board of review which contains a sketch with measurements of the subject home.

² The comparables are presented in two grid analyses and are renumbered as #1 through #6 for ease of reference.

neighborhood code as the subject. The parcels range in size from 14,486 to 25,784 square feet of land area³ and are improved with 2-story homes of brick and frame exterior construction ranging in size from 3,686 to 4,789 square feet of living area. The dwellings were built in 2004 or 2005. Each home has a basement, one of which has finished area and three of which are walkouts, central air conditioning, one or two fireplaces, and a garage ranging in size from 665 to 1,015 square feet of building area. Comparable #1 has an inground swimming pool. The comparables sold from November 2020 to September 2021 for prices ranging from \$565,000 to \$855,000 or from \$126.85 to \$183.46 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 \$322,248. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$966,841 or \$212.54 per square foot of living area, land included, when applying the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.⁴ In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales located within 0.5 of a mile from the subject, together with property record cards for both parties' comparables, a grid analysis of the appellants' comparables, and maps depicting the locations of both parties' comparables in relation to the subject. Comparable #2 is the same property as the appellants' comparable #1. The parcels range in size from 16,269 to 66,336 square feet of land area and are improved with 2-story homes of frame and brick exterior construction ranging in size from square feet of living area. The home were built from 2003 to 2015. Each home features a basement, three of which have finished area and two of which are walkouts, central air conditioning, one or two fireplaces, and a garage ranging in size from 660 to 1,015 square feet of building area. Comparables #2 and #4 each have an inground swimming pool. The comparables sold from April 2019 to February 2022 for prices ranging from \$759,900 to \$1,099,000 or from \$181.64 to \$258.65 per square foot of living area, including land.

The board of review submitted a brief contending that the subject sold in April 2019 for a price of \$972,000 and since that purchase the subject has been improved with a new roof, a 677 square foot deck, and an enclosed porch was converted to living area. The board of review asserted the subject has a 1.10 acre lot of which 5,840 square feet is a natural easement. Based on this evidence, the board of review offered to stipulate to an assessment of \$341,592.

The appellants rejected the board of review's offer.

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

³ Additional details regarding the comparables not reported by the appellants are found in the board of review's evidence, which contains a grid analysis and property record cards for these properties.

⁴ Sec. 1910.50(c)(1) of the Board's procedural rules provides that in all counties other than Cook, the three-year county wide assessment level as certified by the Department of Revenue will be considered. 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.50(c)(1). As of the development of this Final Administrative decision, the Department of Revenue has not published figures for tax year 2022.

construction costs. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(c). The Board finds the appellants did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The record contains a total of nine comparable sales, with one common sale, for the Board's consideration. The Board gives less weight to the appellants' comparable #1/board of review's comparable #2 and the board of review's comparable #1, which sold less proximate in time to the assessment date than the other comparables in this record. The Board gives less weight to the appellants' comparable #2, which sold for considerably less than the other sales in this record, indicating this sale was an outlier. The Board also gives less weight to the appellants' comparables #4, #5, and #6, due to substantial differences from the subject in dwelling size.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the appellants' comparable #3 and the board of review's comparables #3 and #4, which sold more proximate in time to the assessment date and are more similar to the subject in dwelling size, age, location, and some features, but have varying degrees of similarity to the subject in site size and only one comparable has an inground swimming pool like the subject, suggesting adjustments to these comparables would be needed to make them more equivalent to the subject. These most similar comparables sold for prices ranging from \$760,000 to \$1,099,000 or from \$158.70 to \$258.65 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$966,841 or \$212.54 per square foot of living area, including land, which is within the range established by the best comparable sales in this record. Based on this evidence and after considering appropriate adjustments to the best comparables for differences from the subject, the Board finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is not 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: March 26, 2024



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

Michael & Marion Coco, by attorney:
George N. Reveliotis
Reveliotis Law, P.C.
1030 Higgins Road
Suite 101
Park Ridge, IL 60068

COUNTY

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