



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

APPELLANT: Bhavin Shah
DOCKET NO.: 06-31127.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 17-17-113-110-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Bhavin Shah, the appellant(s), by attorney Stephanie Park, of Park & Longstreet, P.C. in Rolling Meadows; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds a reduction 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: \$4,732
IMPR.: \$34,519
TOTAL: \$39,251

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of a 816 square foot parcel of land improved with a seven-year old, three-story, masonry, single-family dwelling containing 1,859 square feet of living area, three baths, a fireplace, and air conditioning. The appellant argued both unequal treatment in the assessment process and that the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in the property's assessed valuation as the bases of this appeal.

In support of the equity argument, the appellant, via counsel, submitted descriptions and assessment information on a total of 12 properties suggested as comparable and located within subject's neighborhood. The properties are described as three-story, masonry, single-family dwellings with between two and three and one-half baths, a fireplace, and air conditioning. The properties range: in age from seven to nine years; in size from 1,812 to 1,966 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$20.68 to \$24.89 per square foot of living area.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted copies of the warranty deeds and legal descriptions for five properties suggested as comparable. These properties are described as three-story, masonry, single-family dwellings with three baths, a fireplace, and air conditioning. The properties are seven years old and contain 1,794 square feet of living area. They sold between June 2004 and February 2007 for prices ranging from \$395,000 to \$425,000, or from \$220.18 to \$226.87 per square foot of living area. Comparables #3 and #5 include a second property identification number of each deed. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's improvement assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's total assessment of \$52,308 with an improvement assessment of \$47,576 or \$25.59 per square foot of living area was disclosed. This assessment reflects a market value of \$516,877 or \$278.04 per square foot of living area using the Illinois Department of Revenue's 2006 three year median level of assessment of 10.12% for Cook County Class 2 property. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review presented descriptions and assessment information on a total of four properties suggested as comparable and located within the subject's neighborhood with two located on the subject's block. The properties are described as three-story, masonry, single-family dwellings with three baths, a fireplace, air conditioning, and, for two properties, a partial, unfinished basement. The properties are seven years old and range in size from 1,859 to 1,996 square feet of living area and in improvement assessment from \$25.57 to \$30.34 per square foot of living area. On property located on the subject's block sold in April 2004 for \$387,851 or \$208.63 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

At hearing, the appellant's attorney asserted that the subject was overvalued and over assessed based on a review of the suggested comparables. In regards to the sales, the appellant's attorney did not know if the data for the two sales that had two property identification numbers (PINs) included a description and information on both those PINs.

The board of review's representative, Nick Jordan, argued that two of the sales occurred in 2007 after the lien year in question.

After reviewing the record and considering the evidence, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal. The Board further finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

When overvaluation is claimed the appellant has the burden of proving the value of the property by a preponderance of the evidence. National City Bank of Michigan/Illinois v. Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board, 331Ill.App.3d 1038 (3rd Dist. 2002);

Winnebago County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 313 Ill.App.3d 179 (2nd Dist. 2000). Proof of market value may consist of an appraisal, a recent arm's length sale of the subject property, recent sales of comparable properties, or recent construction costs of the subject property. 86 Ill.Admin.Code 1910.65(c). Having considered the evidence presented, the PTAB concludes that the evidence indicates a reduction based on market value is warranted.

The parties submitted a total of six properties suggested as comparable to the subject. The PTAB finds the appellant's comparables #1, #2 and #4 and the board of review's comparable #2 similar to the subject in design, construction, size, location, and age with the board of review's comparable the most similar. Due to their similarities to the subject, these comparables received the most weight in the PTAB's analysis. The properties are masonry, three-story, single-family dwellings. The properties are seven years old and contain 1,794 or 1,859 square feet of living area. They sold between April 2004 and March 2007 for prices ranging from \$387,851 to \$424,000, or from \$208.63 to \$236.34 per square foot of living area. In comparison, the subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$278.04 per square foot of living area is above the range of these comparables. After considering adjustments and the differences in both parties' comparables when compared to the subject, the Board finds the subject's per square foot assessment is not supported and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted. The PTAB further finds that once this reduction is applied the subject is equitably assessed.

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.

Ronald R. Cuit

Chairman

K. L. Fern

Member

Frank A. Huff

Member

Mario Morris

Member

Acting Member

DISSENTING: _____

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

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: January 20, 2012

Allen Castrovillari

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 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 the subsequent year 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.

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.