



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

APPELLANT: Kevin Coogan  
DOCKET NO.: 07-30270.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 17-04-300-051-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Kevin Coogan, the appellant, by attorney Lisa A. Marino, of Marino & Assoc., PC 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:** \$ 7,997  
**IMPR.:** \$ 35,911  
**TOTAL:** \$ 43,908

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property consists of a 775 square foot parcel of land improved with a three-year old, three-story, masonry, townhome style dwelling containing 1,692 square feet of living area. Features include two and one half baths, three bedrooms, central air conditioning, one fireplace and an attached two-car garage.

The appellant, via counsel, raised two arguments: first, that there is unequal treatment in the assessment process; and second, that the subject's market value is not accurately reflected in its assessment as the bases of this appeal.

In support of the equity argument, the appellant submitted descriptive and assessment data for three suggested comparables located within a two mile radius of the subject. The properties are improved with a masonry, townhome style dwelling with central air conditioning. They range in improvement assessment from \$18.71 to \$21.55 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment is \$25.88 per square foot of living area.

As to the overvaluation argument, the appellant submitted a copy of a settlement statement indicating that the subject was purchased on March 30, 2004 for a base contract price of \$429,900 plus upgrades. The settlement statement indicates that a realtor was involved in this transaction and that an owner's policy for title insurance was issued in the amount of \$437,330. Based upon this analysis, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The board of review submitted "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's total assessment was \$51,794. This assessment reflects a total market value of \$515,876 or \$304.89 per square foot based upon the application of the Illinois Department of Revenue's three-year median level of assessment for tax year 2007 of 10.04% for class 2 property.

The board of review submitted descriptive and assessment data as well as photographs relating to four suggested comparables. They are all located on the same block as the subject. The properties are improved with a 1,692 square foot, three-year old, three-story, masonry, townhome style dwelling with two and one half baths, three bedrooms, central air conditioning, one fireplace and an attached two-car garage. Their improvement assessment is \$25.88 per square foot of living area. As a result of its analysis, the board requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

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

The appellant contends unequal treatment in the subject's improvement assessment as the basis of the appeal. Taxpayers who object to an assessment on the basis of lack of uniformity bear the burden of proving the disparity of assessment valuations by clear and convincing evidence. Kankakee County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 131 Ill.2d 1 (1989). After an analysis of the data, the Board finds that the appellant has not met this burden.

The Board finds that comparables #1 through #4 submitted by the board of review are most similar to the subject in style, design, age, location, improvement size, and amenities as they are located in the same development as the subject property and are identical in their features. In analysis, the Board accorded the most weight to these comparables. These comparables have an improvement assessment of \$25.88 which is identical to that of the subject. Therefore, the Board finds no reduction is warranted as to this issue raised by the appellant.

As to the appellant's second issue, 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); 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.Adm.Code 1910.65(c)). Having considered the evidence presented, the Board finds that the appellant has met this burden and that a reduction is warranted.

The Board finds that the best evidence of market value was the recent purchase price of the subject property. The un rebutted evidence demonstrated that the subject sold in March 2004 for a total of \$437,330 as indicated by the owner's title insurance coverage listed on the settlement statement. This was a transfer between unrelated parties and a broker's fee was paid on this transaction. The Board further finds that the county failed to proffer any evidence indicating either that this sale was not an arm's length transaction or that there were sales comparables located within the subject's area which rebutted the validity of the subject's sale price.

On the basis of this analysis, the Board finds that the subject had a fair market value of \$437,330 as of the 2007 assessment date at issue. Since fair market value has been established, the Department of Revenue median level of assessment for Cook County class 2, residential property of 10.04% for tax year 2007 shall apply to this subject property. Therefore, the Board finds that the appellant has met its burden by a preponderance of the evidence and that the subject does warrant a reduction based upon the market data submitted into evidence.

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

*[Signature]*

Member

*[Signature]*

Member

*[Signature]*

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: 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.