



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

APPELLANT: Michael Taskila
DOCKET NO.: 07-04074.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 09-06-406-009

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Michael Taskila, the appellant, and the DuPage 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 DuPage County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$104,710
IMPR.: \$128,600
TOTAL: \$233,310

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of a 1½-story single family dwelling of frame construction that contains 2,519 square feet of living area. Features of the home include a full unfinished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a two-car garage. The dwelling was constructed in 2000. The property is located on a 30,000 square foot parcel in Downers Grove, Downers Grove Township, DuPage County.

The appellant contends overvaluation and assessment inequity as the bases of the appeal. In support of the overvaluation argument the appellant submitted two appraisals of the subject property. The first appraisal was prepared by Edward Burns, a certified real estate appraiser. Burns developed both the cost and sales comparison approaches to value.

Under the cost approach the appraiser estimated a land value of \$400,000. The cost new of the improvements was based on residential cost handbooks and modified by local builder costs. The cost new of the improvements was estimated to be \$289,360. The appraiser estimated physical depreciation to be \$4,832 using an effective age of 1-2 years and remaining economic life of 60

years. Deducting depreciation and adding the land value resulted in an estimated value under the cost approach of \$699,528.

The appraiser used 3 sales in the sales comparison approach composed of 1½-story dwellings of frame and brick construction that ranged in size from 2,861 to 2,945 square feet of living area. The comparables were located from .77 to 1.03 miles from the subject and ranged in age from 2 to 4 years old. Each comparable had a full basement with one being finished, each comparable had central air conditioning, the comparables had 1 or 3 fireplaces and each had a two-car garage. The comparables had smaller lots than the subject ranging in size from 7,920 to 12,780 square feet. The sales occurred from October 2004 to May 2005 for prices ranging from \$688,500 to \$790,100 or from \$240.65 to \$268.29 per square foot of living area. After making adjustments to the sales for differences from the subject, the appraiser determined the comparables had adjusted sales prices ranging from \$678,620 to \$741,860. Using this data the appraiser estimated the subject had an estimated value under the sales comparison approach of \$690,000.

Reconciling the two approaches to value, the appraiser gave most weight to the sales comparison approach and estimated the subject had a market value of \$690,000 as of July 12, 2005.

In the report Burns had indicated the subject had 2,864 square feet of living area. The appellant had indentified 364 square feet on the schematic of the home as a screened-in porch that is not heated or air conditioned. He contends this should not be considered as living area.

The second appraisal was prepared by Adele Marie Coldman, an Illinois Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser. Coldman developed both the cost and sales comparison approaches to value.

Under the cost approach Coldman estimated a land value of \$350,000. The replacement cost new of the improvements was based on Marshall/Swift cost indices and market research. The cost new of the improvements was estimated to be \$366,560. The appraiser estimated physical depreciation to be \$7,331 or 2% of cost new using an effective age/economic life method. The appraiser also included \$7,500 as the value of site improvements. Deducting depreciation and adding site improvements as well as the land value resulted in an estimated value under the cost approach of \$716,700.

The appraiser used 4 sales in the sales comparison approach composed of 2-story dwellings that ranged in size from 2,293 to 2,770 square feet of living area. The comparables were located from .40 to .80 miles from the subject and ranged in age from 4 to 14 years old. Each comparable had a full or partial basement with two being finished, each comparable had central air conditioning, the comparables had 1 or 2 fireplaces and each had a two-car garage. The comparables had smaller lots than the subject ranging in size from 6,600 to 15,000 square feet. The

sales occurred from May 2007 to December 2007 for prices ranging from \$650,000 to \$725,000 or from \$255.70 to \$298.74 per square foot of living area. After making adjustments to the sales for differences from the subject, the appraiser determined the comparables had adjusted sales prices ranging from \$697,410 to \$701,590. Using this data the appraiser estimated the subject had an estimated value under the sales comparison approach of \$700,000.

Reconciling the two approaches to value, the appraiser gave most weight to the sales comparison approach and estimated the subject had a market value of \$700,000 as of December 23, 2007.

In support of the assessment inequity argument the appellant provided descriptions and assessment information on four comparables improved with multi-story dwellings that range in size from 2,240 to 3,966 square feet of living area. The comparables range in age from 3 to 18 years old and are of frame construction. Each comparable has a full basement, central air conditioning, one fireplace and an attached garage that range in size from 484 to 680 square feet. These properties have improvement assessments that range from \$115,710 to \$220,810 or from \$51.66 to \$55.68 per square foot of living area.

Based on this evidence the appellant requested the subject's total assessment be reduced to \$230,000.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the final assessment of the subject totaling \$264,000 was disclosed. The board of review indicated the subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$792,079 or \$314.44 per square foot of living area. The subject has an improvement assessment of \$159,290 or \$62.24 per square foot of living area.

In support of the assessment the board of review submitted an Addendum to Board of Review Notes on Appeal and Exhibit #1, an assessment data sheet and comparables selected by the Downers Grove Township Assessor's office.

The assessor selected six comparables, three of which sold, composed of multi-story dwellings that range in size from 1,896 to 2,987 square feet of living area. The dwellings were originally constructed from 1932 to 1996, with comparables #1 and #2 having update construction in 2001 and 1996, respectively. Each comparable had a basement with three being partially finished, four comparables are described as having central air conditioning, the comparables have one or two fireplaces and the comparables have garages ranging in size from 520 to 766 square feet. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from \$80,630 to \$181,870 or from \$43.00 to \$61.00 per square foot of living area, rounded. Comparables #1 through #3 were reported to have sold from July 2007 to July 2008 for prices ranging from \$650,000 to \$850,000 or from \$323.33 to \$431.25 per square foot of living area.

Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

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

The appellant argued in part overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. When market value is the basis of the appeal the value of the property 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). The Board finds the appellant met this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The Property Tax Appeal Board finds the best evidence of market value in the record consists of the two appraisals submitted by the appellant. Each appraisal contained a cost approach to value and a sales comparison approach to value. Additionally, the appraisers arrived at very similar estimates of market value for the subject property. Burns gave most weight to the sales comparison approach and estimated the subject had a market value of \$690,000 as of July 12, 2005. Coldman also gave most weight to the sales comparison approach and estimated the subject had a market value of \$700,000 as of December 23, 2007. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$792,079, which is significantly above the appraised values.

The board of review's evidence did included information on three sales; however, there was no adjustment process provided to account for differences from the subject and the comparable sales were not as similar to subject property in age and size as were the comparable sales provided in the two appraisals.

In conclusion the Property Tax Appeal Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$700,000 as of January 1, 2007. The Board further finds that as the result of the reduction in the subject's assessment based on this market value finding, no further reduction to the subject's assessment is warranted based on a lack of assessment uniformity.

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 M. Louie

Member

Shawn R. Lerbis

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: August 20, 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.