



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

APPELLANT: Terrance Johnson
DOCKET NO.: 08-02149.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 14-33-376-024

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Terrance Johnson, 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: \$3,960
IMPR.: \$5,650
TOTAL: \$9,610

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of an 88 year-old, one-story frame, bungalow style dwelling that contains 679 square feet of living area. Features of the home include a crawl-space foundation and an unfinished attic.¹

In writing, the parties presented no objection to a decision in this matter being rendered on the evidence submitted in the record. Therefore, the decision of the Property Tax Appeal Board contained herein shall be based upon the evidence contained in and made a part of this record.

The appellant through counsel submitted evidence to the Property Tax Appeal Board claiming overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted a grid analysis of three comparable sales with applicable Multiple Listing Service sheets. The comparables were located from 2 to

¹ The board of review reported in a grid analysis that the subject had a 340 square foot basement, but on the property record card reported no basement.

10 blocks from the subject and consist of three, one-story and one, two-story frame dwellings that were built between 1920 and 1930. The dwellings range in size from 624 to 838 square feet of living area. Each comparable has an unfinished basement and three comparables have garages ranging in size from 240 to 576 square feet of building area. These properties sold between November 2007 and March 2008 for prices ranging from \$7,000 to \$12,500 or from \$8.35 to \$19.23 per square foot of living area, land included. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested the subject's assessment be reduced to \$4,000 reflecting a building assessment of \$40,000 and resulting in a market value of approximately \$12,000.

The board of review submitted its Board of Review Notes on Appeal wherein the subject's total assessment of \$9,610 was disclosed. The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$29,007 or \$42.72 per square foot of living area, land included, using the 2008 three-year median level of assessments for Peoria County of 33.13%.

In support of the subject's estimated market value as reflected by its assessment, the board of review submitted a grid analysis of five comparable properties along with property record cards. The comparables were located from 0.197 to 0.767 miles from the subject. The comparables consist of one-story frame, bungalow or cottage style dwellings that were built between 1914 and 1930. The dwellings range in size from 624 to 960 square feet of living area. Features of the comparables include full unfinished basements and four comparables have garages that contain from 160 to 600 square feet of building area. One comparable has central air conditioning. These properties sold between November 2006 and November 2007 for prices ranging from \$25,200 to \$41,500 or from \$39.47 to \$48.90 per square foot of living area including land. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested the subject's estimated market value as reflected by its assessment be confirmed.

In rebuttal, the appellant argued the board of review's comparables #2 and #4 were both located in the East Bluff whereas the subject was in the West Bluff. Appellant also pointed out comparable #1 sold in February 2007 for \$10,500 and then resold in November 2007 as reported by the board of review after numerous updates as shown on the applicable Multiple Listing Service sheets. As to comparables #2, #3 and #4, the appellant contended the properties have updates and features not enjoyed by the subject. Appellant also noted that all of the comparables whereas the subject "has partial."²

² The contention by the appellant that the subject has a partial basement differs from the Residential Appeal form asserting the subject has a crawl-space foundation and from the property record card for the subject which indicates no basement.

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

The appellant contends the assessment of the subject property is excessive and not reflective of its market value. 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 evidence in the record does not support a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The Board finds the parties submitted eight comparables for its consideration. The Board gave less weight to the appellant's comparable #2 because of its two-story design as compared to the subject's one-story design. The Board also gave less weight to board of review comparable #3 due to its larger living area size when compared to the subject. Despite the fact that all remaining seven comparables have full unfinished basements, the Board finds these seven comparables were most similar to the subject in design, exterior construction, age and features and sold for prices ranging from \$8.35 to \$48.90 per square foot of living area, land included. The subject's estimated market value as reflected by its assessment of \$29,007 or \$42.72 per square foot of living area falls within this range. After considering the most comparable sales on this record along with adjustments and differences in both parties' comparables when compared to the subject, the Board finds the appellant did not demonstrate the subject property's assessment to be excessive in relation to its market value and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted on this record.

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

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.