

# FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: William A. Timpe DOCKET NO.: 22-22409.001-R-1 PARCEL NO.: 01-12-303-047-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are William A. Timpe, the appellant, by attorney Brian P. Liston of the Law Offices of Liston & Tsantilis, P.C. in Chicago; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented in this matter, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds <u>a reduction</u> 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:** \$10,000 **IMPR.:** \$33,350 **TOTAL:** \$43,350

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 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 two-story dwelling of frame and masonry exterior construction with 3,494 square feet of living area. The dwelling is approximately 22 years old. Features of the home include a full basement,  $2\frac{1}{2}$  bathrooms, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a two-car garage. The property has an approximately 3,666 square foot site and is located in Inverness, Barrington Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-95 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant's appeal is based on overvaluation. In support of this argument the appellant submitted evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased on January 14, 2021, for a price of \$433,500. The appellant disclosed in Section IV of the appeal petition that the subject property was purchased from John A. Wojciechowski and the parties to the transaction were not related. The appellant also disclosed the property was not sold due to a foreclosure, nor was it

sold using a contract for deed. To document the sale, the appellant submitted copies of the sales contract and the settlement statement. The sales contract depicted two separate realty agencies and two separate real estate agents, one representing the buyer and the other representing the seller.<sup>1</sup> The settlement statement reiterated the sale date and sale price and depicted commissions were paid to two realty agencies. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to reflect the purchase price.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$60,900. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$609,000 or \$174.30 per square foot of living area, including land, when applying the level of assessment for class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance of 10%.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on two comparable properties that have the same assessment neighborhood code and property classification code as the subject. The properties are located in Inverness or Barrington, one of which is within the same block as the subject, and one is within the subject's subarea. The comparable sites contain 3,142 or 3,879 square feet of land area and are improved with two-story dwellings of frame or frame and masonry exterior construction. The dwellings are 6 and 18 years old and contain 2,321 and 3,494 square feet of living area, respectively. The comparables each have a full basement, central air conditioning and a two-car garage. Comparable #2 has a fireplace. The properties sold in February 2021 and June 2022 for \$619,990 and \$690,000 or for \$267.12 and \$197.48 per square foot of living area, land included, respectively. The board of review also reported the subject was purchased on March 11, 2021, for \$433,500 or \$124.07 per square foot of living area, including land.<sup>2</sup> 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 met this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The appellant submitted evidence of the 2021 sale of the subject property and the board of review submitted two comparables sales to support their respective positions before the Board.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the purchase of the subject property in January 2021 for a price of \$433,500. The appellant provided evidence demonstrating the sale had the elements of an arm's length transaction. The appellant disclosed the parties to the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The appellant reported in Section IV of the appeal petition that the subject was sold by owner and was not advertised for sale.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The parties differ as to the subject's date of the sale. The Board finds the best evidence to be the settlement statement provided by the appellant which depicted a sale date of January 14, 2021.

transaction were not related and the property was not sold due to a foreclosure action or using a contact for deed. In further support of the transaction, the appellant submitted copies of the sales contract and the settlement statement. The sales contract depicted the buyer and seller were each represented by separate realty agencies and agents, and the settlement statement depicted commissions were paid to two realty agencies, suggesting the property had been advertised on the open market and also reiterated the sale date and purchase price. The Board finds the board of review did not present any substantive evidence to challenge the arm's length nature of the subject's sale transaction. In addition, the assessing officials did not refute the contention that the purchase price was reflective of market value. The Board finds the purchase price of \$433,500 is below the market value of \$609,000 as reflected by the assessment. Furthermore, the Board gave less weight to board of review comparable #1 due to its significantly smaller dwelling size and newer age, when compared to the subject. The Board finds the board of review's remaining comparable sale does not overcome the weight given to the subject's arm'slength sale transaction. As a final point, the board of review reported the same sale of the subject in 2021 for \$433,500, which is the basis of the appellant's appeal on market value grounds. Based on this record the Board finds the subject's assessment is not reflective of market value and a reduction in the subject's assessment is justified commensurate with the appellant's request.

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.

2	1. Fen
	Chairman
CAR .	
Member	Member
Dan Dikinin	Swah Bokley
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.

August 19, 2025
WillFUL
Clark of the December Ton Asset December

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 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**

William A. Timpe, by attorney: Brian P. Liston Law Offices of Liston & Tsantilis, P.C. 200 S. Wacker Drive Suite 820 Chicago, IL 60606

## **COUNTY**

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