



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

APPELLANT: Andrew & Mary Corbett  
DOCKET NO.: 09-04180.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 07-20-209-017

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Andrew and Mary Corbett, 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:** \$19,550  
**IMPR.:** \$59,200  
**TOTAL:** \$78,750

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a two-story townhouse with 1,600 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 2006. Features of the home include a partial basement that is finished, central air conditioning, one fireplace, two bedrooms and a two-car integral garage with 484 square feet of building area. The property has a 1,798 square foot site and is located in Aurora, Naperville Township, DuPage County.

The appellants contend overvaluation based on comparable sales and an appraisal. The appellants completed Section V - Comparable Sales/Assessment Grid Analysis of the petition using four comparable sales. The comparables were improved with two-story townhouses of frame construction that each had 1,600 square feet of living area. The dwellings were constructed from 2006 to 2008 and had vinyl siding exteriors. The properties were located within .25 miles of the subject and had the same neighborhood code assigned by the assessor as the subject property. Each comparable had a partial basement that was finished, central air conditioning and a two car attached garage. These properties were reported to have sold from June 2008 to October 2008 for prices ranging from \$205,000 to \$225,000 or from \$128.13 to \$140.62 per square foot of living area including land.

The appellants also submitted an appraisal of the subject estimating the property had a market value of \$225,000 as of April 23, 2009. The appraisal was prepared by Rodolfo Rosales of Direct Appraisals, Inc. Rosales is a State of Illinois Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser. The appraisal was prepared for Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. for refinancing. Under the cost approach the appraiser estimated the subject had a market value of \$180,440.

In developing the sales comparison approach the appraiser used four sales and two listings. The comparables were improved with two-story townhomes that each had 1,600 square feet of living area. These properties were constructed in 2006 and 2007 and were located within .16 miles of the subject property. The comparables had similar features as the subject property. The sales occurred from June 2008 to April 2009 for prices ranging from \$215,000 to \$246,000 or from \$134.38 to \$153.75 per square foot of living area. The two listings each had prices of \$249,000 or \$153.63 per square foot of living area. The appraiser made downward adjustments to comparables #1, #2 and #4 of \$7,000 and \$12,000 for date of sale/time and downward adjustments to comparables #5 and #6 of \$10,000 due to those properties being active listings. Sales #1, #2, #3 and #5 were also given \$5,000 downward adjustments due to bedroom count. The adjusted sales prices ranged from \$210,000 to \$239,000. Based these sales the appraiser estimated the subject had a market value under the sales comparison approach of \$225,000.

In reconciling the two approaches the appraiser gave most weight to the sales comparison approach and estimated the subject property had a market value of \$225,000 as of April 23, 2009.

The appellants also provided a list of five sales of purported identical townhomes in the subject's subdivision that sold from March 2009 to July 2009 for prices ranging from \$169,000 to \$215,000.

Based on this evidence the appellants requested the subject's assessment be reduced to \$75,000 to reflect the appraised value.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein its final assessment of the subject totaling \$85,240 was disclosed. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$256,280, rounded, or \$160.18 per square foot of living area, including land, when applying the 2009 three year average median level of assessments for DuPage County of 33.26%.

In support of the assessment the board of review submitted an Addendum to Board of Review Notes on Appeal and an assessment/sales data sheets which listed the appellants' comparables and comparable sales selected by the township assessor, marked as Exhibit #1. The exhibit also had a narrative commenting on the appellants' and the assessor's data. The assessor noted that appellants' comparable sale #2, which is also

appraisal comparable sale #2, was a new home when it sold in October 2008 for a price of \$223,000. The assessor further noted the four sales selected by the appellants lacked fireplaces and only comparable #4 had the same Windsor floor plan as the subject.

With respect to the appellants' appraisal the assessor asserted that sales #1 and #2 were new units and had different floor plans than the subject. It was further noted that appraisal sale #4 sold in 2009.

The assessor provided a grid analysis using three comparable sales. The comparables were improved with two-story townhomes of frame construction that each had 1,600 square feet of living area. The dwellings were constructed in 2008. The comparables had the same neighborhood code as the subject property. Each comparable has three bedrooms, a partial finished basement, central air conditioning and a two-car garage. One comparable had a fireplace. Two were described as being inside units and one comparable was described as being an end unit, the same as the subject property. All were described as having the same floor plan as the subject property. The sales occurred in May and October 2008 for prices ranging from \$253,990 to \$260,435 or from \$158.74 to \$162.77 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 appellants contend the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in its assessed valuation. 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 (3<sup>rd</sup> Dist. 2002). Proof of market value may consist of an appraisal of the subject property, a recent sale, comparable sales or construction costs. (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(c)). The Board finds the evidence in this record supports a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The Board finds the record contains twelve comparable sales of two-story townhomes that were similar to the subject in location, construction, style, age and features. The Board finds the best comparables to be those that sold most proximate in time to the January 1, 2009 assessment date at issue, which include appellants' comparables #2 (which is also appraisal comparable sale #2) and #4, appraisal comparable #1 and board of review/assessor comparable #2. These sales occurred from September through October 2008 for prices ranging from \$223,000 to \$253,990 or from \$139.38 to \$158.74 per square foot of living

area, land included. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$256,280, rounded, or \$160.18 per square foot of living area, including land, when applying the 2009 three year average median level of assessments for DuPage County of 33.26%. The subject's assessment reflects a market value above the range established by the best sales in the record. Based on this evidence the Board finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is justified.

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.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman



\_\_\_\_\_  
Member



\_\_\_\_\_  
Member



\_\_\_\_\_  
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: July 20, 2012



\_\_\_\_\_  
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.