



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

APPELLANT: Kent Jones
DOCKET NO.: 07-01254.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 18-03-303-012

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Kent Jones, the appellant, by attorney Clyde B. Hendricks in Peoria, and the Peoria County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds no change in the assessment of the property as established by the Peoria County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$900
IMPR.: \$8,400
TOTAL: \$9,300

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of a 107 year-old, two-story style frame dwelling that contains 2,226 square feet of living area. Features of the home include a full unfinished basement.

Through his attorney, the appellant appeared before the Property Tax Appeal Board contending overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted property record cards and a grid analysis of three comparable properties. The comparables consist of two-story or one and one-half-story frame dwellings that were built in 1900 or 1920 and range in size from 1,294 to 2,409 square feet of living area. All three comparables have basements that contain from 127 to 850 square feet and two have one-car or two-car garages. The appellant's grid indicated the comparables had quality grades ranging from C-1 to D+5. These properties were reported to have sold between October 2006 and May 2007 for prices ranging from \$8,500 to \$12,000 or from \$3.52 to \$6.95 per square foot of living area including land. Based on this evidence, the

appellant requested the subject's assessment be reduced to \$7,670.

The appellant's first witness was William Leroy, who prepared the data presented in the grid analysis. Leroy testified that he is a full-time realtor with 25 years experience; during that time he has occasionally done "tax protesting" with the greatest workload in the quadrennial reassessment years. From time to time, Leroy performs this "tax protesting" work with Robert O. Kaiser. Leroy is not a licensed appraiser and does not have any appraisal designations. Based on his professional experience, Leroy contended that investment properties are generally harder to sell because they are in poorer areas, are generally not well maintained, and there is a limited pool of buyers who may be purchasing with cash.

The second witness called by the appellant was Robert O. Kaiser who assisted Leroy in gathering the comparable data. Kaiser is not an appraiser and has no appraisal designations; he was a real estate agent until March 31, 2008, but his primary profession is as a certified public accountant. Kaiser has bought and sold hundreds of houses in the local Peoria real estate market over the past 25 years through various companies he has owned.

The board of review submitted its Board of Review Notes on Appeal wherein the subject's total assessment of \$9,300 was disclosed. The subject has an estimated market value of \$27,995 or \$12.58 per square foot of living area including land, as reflected by its assessment and Peoria County's 2007 three-year median level of assessments of 33.22%.

In support of the subject's estimated market value as reflected in its assessment, the board of review submitted property record cards and a grid analysis of three comparable properties. The comparables were described as two-story frame dwellings that were built in 1900 and range in size from 1,480 to 2,168 square feet of living area. Features of the comparables include basements that contain from 440 to 696 square feet. Two comparables have garages of 240 or 484 square feet of building area, one has a fireplace and one has central air conditioning. These properties sold between October 2005 and August 2007 for prices ranging from \$44,000 to \$72,500 or from \$25.46 to \$33.78 per square foot of living area including land. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested the subject's assessment be confirmed.

In rebuttal, the appellant argued the board of review's comparable 1 is a duplex, unlike the subject, which is a single family dwelling. The appellant also argued the board of review's comparable 2 sold outside the multiple listing service and the board of review's comparable 3 had updates and amenities not enjoyed by the subject.

After hearing the testimony 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 Property Tax

Appeal Board further finds no reduction in the subject property's assessment is warranted.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. When market value is the basis of the appeal, the value must be proved by a preponderance of the evidence. National City Bank of Michigan/Illinois v. Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board, 331 Ill.App.3d 1038 (3rd Dist. 2002). After analyzing the market evidence submitted, the Board finds the appellant has failed to overcome this burden.

The Board finds the parties submitted six comparable sales for its consideration. The Board gave less weight to the appellant's comparable 2 and the board of review's comparables 1 and 3 because they differed significantly in living area when compared to the subject. The Board finds the appellant's comparables 1 and 3 and the board of review's comparable 2 were similar to the subject in terms of design, age, size and features and sold for prices ranging from \$3.52 to \$33.44 per square foot of living area including land. The subject's estimated market value as reflected by its assessment of \$12.58 per square foot of living area including land falls within and nearer the low end of this range. After considering adjustments and differences in both parties' comparables when compared to the subject, the Board finds the evidence in the record supports the subject's assessment.

In conclusion, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds the appellant has failed to prove overvaluation by a preponderance of the evidence and the subject's assessment as determined by the board of review is correct and no reduction is 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.

Ronald R. Cuit

Chairman

Frank J. Huff

Member

Member

Mario M. Louie

Shawn R. Lerski

Member

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: May 21, 2010

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.