



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

APPELLANT: David Dunkin  
DOCKET NO.: 07-24930.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 05-29-201-010-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are David Dunkin, the appellant, by attorney David C. Dunkin, of Arnstein & Lehr in Chicago; 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:** \$ 34,883  
**IMPR.:** \$ 88,107  
**TOTAL:** \$ 122,990

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property consists of 16,771 square feet of land improved with an 83-year old, two-story, frame, single-family dwelling which is owner-occupied. The improvement includes a partial basement, three full and one half-baths, three fireplaces, and a two-car garage. The subject's site is located in New Trier Township.

The appellant raised two arguments: that the improvement's size proffered by the county is inaccurate; 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.

As to the subject improvement's size, the appellant submitted a residential appraisal report reflecting 2,886 square feet of living area determined via the appraiser's inspection. Moreover, the appraisal report included exterior photographs of the subject's improvement as well as a diagram of the subject's floor plans. In contrast, the board of review submitted a copy of a property characteristic printout reflecting 3,576 square feet of living area.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted a residential appraisal summary report of the subject property with an effective date of January 1, 2007 undertaken by Pamela Sonshine, who holds the designation of Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser. The appraiser estimated a market value for the subject of \$1,225,000, while developing the cost and sales comparison approaches to value.

The appraisal stated that the subject was improved with a detached, single-family dwelling in existing construction and in average condition. The appraisal indicated that the subject's actual age was 83 years, but that the improvement's effective age was 50 years.

Under the cost approach, the appraiser estimated the site value at \$950,000. In estimating a replacement cost new for the subject, she opined a cost of \$175.00 per square foot for the building; \$35.00 per square foot for the basement area; and \$25.00 per square foot for the garage area reflecting a cost new of \$565,825. Less depreciation estimated at \$310,483 resulted in a depreciated cost of the improvements at \$255,342. Adding site improvements of \$25,000 as well as the land value resulted in a market value estimate under this approach of \$1,230,300.

Under the sales comparison approach to value, the appraiser utilized four sale comparables located within a one and one-half mile radius from the subject as well as sited in the suburb of Winnetka, as is the subject. In support of this, the appraisal included a map of the subject's area with the location of the suggested comparables identified thereon. The comparables sold from May, 2006, through January, 2007, for prices that ranged from \$1,232,000 to \$1,450,000, or from \$380.45 to \$486.14 per square foot. The properties were improved with a two-story, masonry, frame or stucco, single-family dwelling, while the appraiser determined that they were in good or average condition. The properties ranged: in bathrooms from two full and one half-baths to three full and two half-baths; in actual age from 53 to 114 years; in improvement size from 2,634 to 3,709 square feet of living area; and in land size from 9,500 to 21,785 square feet of land. Each property also included a full basement and a two-car garage. Three properties also included either one or three fireplaces. After making adjustments to the suggested comparables, the appraiser estimated the subject's market value was \$1,225,000, rounded.

The appraiser indicated that most weight was accorded the sales comparison approach to value in reconciling a final value estimate of \$1,225,000 for the subject property. Based upon this data, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's market value.

The board of review submitted "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's total assessment was \$154,715 for tax year 2007. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$1,540,986 using the Illinois Department of Revenue median level

of assessment for class 2, residential property of 10.04% for tax year 2007.

The board also submitted descriptive and assessment data on four suggested equity comparables. These properties ranged in land size from 14,297 to 29,055 square feet. They were improved with a two-story, frame, single-family dwelling. The improvements ranged: in age from 80 to 94 years; in bathrooms from three full baths to three full and one half-baths; in size from 3,360 to 4,346 square feet of living area; and in improvements assessments from \$35.34 to \$39.15 per square foot of living area. Amenities include basement area, a two-car garage, and either one or three fireplaces.

In addition, the grid analysis indicated that property #3 sold in June, 2005, for a price of \$1,900,000 or \$437.18 per square foot. As a result of its analysis, the board requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

After considering the arguments and reviewing the evidence, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal.

As to the issue of the subject's size, the Board finds that the best evidence was submitted by the appellant via the subject's appraisal report. Therefore, the Board finds that the subject's improvement contains 2,886 square feet of living area.

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, 331 Ill.App.3d 1038 (3<sup>rd</sup> Dist. 2002); Winnebago County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 313 Ill.App.3d 179 (2<sup>nd</sup> 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 Board concludes that the appellant has met this burden and that a reduction is warranted.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board finds the best evidence to be the appellant's appraisal. The Board finds this appraisal to be persuasive for the appraiser personally inspected the subject property and undertook two of the three traditional approaches to value in estimating the subject's market value. Moreover, she utilized market data to obtain improved sale comparables while providing sufficient detail regarding each sale as well as appropriate adjustments where necessary.

Further, the Board finds that the board of review's evidence fails to indicate that the sales data relating to property #3 reflected an arm's length transaction.

Therefore, the Board finds that the subject property contained a market value of \$1,225,000 for tax year 2007. Since the market value of the subject has been established, the median level of assessment as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue for class 2, residential property of 10.04% will apply. In applying this level of assessment to the subject, the total assessed value is \$122,990, while the subject's current total assessed value is above this amount at \$154,715. Therefore, the Board finds that a 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.

*Donald R. Cuit*

Chairman

*K. L. Fern*

Member

*Frank A. Huff*

Member

*Mario Morris*

Member

*J. R.*

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 28, 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.