



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

APPELLANT: John Zhang  
DOCKET NO.: 09-20779.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 10-24-106-006-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are John Zhang, the appellant, by attorney Christopher G. Walsh, Jr. of 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:** \$5,950  
**IMPR.:** \$22,550  
**TOTAL:** \$28,500

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a one-story multi-family building of masonry construction containing 2,273 square feet of living area. The two-unit building is 47 years old and is located in Evanston, Evanston Township, Cook County. The property is classified as a class 2-11 residential property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance. Features of the building include a partial basement finished with an apartment, central air conditioning and a 2-car garage.

The appellant contends overvaluation based on a recent sale of the subject property. The appellant's attorney submitted a brief in support of this argument. Counsel indicated the subject property was purchased in May 2009 for a price of \$285,000 or \$125.39 per square foot of living area, land included. To further document the sale, the appellant submitted a copy of the Illinois Real Estate Transfer Declaration, PTAX-203, disclosing the subject property was purchased in May 2009 for a price of \$285,000. The transfer declaration indicated the subject was advertised for sale, and there was no indication the parties were

related. The appellant also submitted a Settlement Statement, affidavit and listing sheet indicating the subject property was purchased in May 2009 for a price of \$285,000. In the brief, counsel argued the subject had a market value of \$285,000 and the assessment should be calculated by applying the 10% level of assessment for Class 2 residential property in Cook County. Based on this record, the appellant requested the subject's assessment be reduced to \$28,500.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein its final assessment of the subject totaling \$38,063 was disclosed. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$427,674 using the 2009 three year average median level of assessments for class 2 property of 8.90% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue. (86 Ill.Admin.Code 1910.50(c)(2)).

In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted a grid analysis of four comparable properties consisting of two-story masonry dwellings that range in age from 40 to 50 years old. The dwellings range in size from 2,303 to 2,780 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a full basement of which one is finished with a recreation room and a 2-car to 3-car garage. Comparables #3 and #4 completed a sale in July 2007 and September 2006 for a price of \$425,000 or \$184.54 per square foot including land and \$500,000 or \$179.86 per square foot of living area, including land, respectively. Comparable #3 was located on the same street and on the same block as the subject. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from \$14.63 to \$15.96 per square foot of living area.

Also attached to the board of review's data was a printout of 20 sales identified only by parcel number and entitled "Class 11 2 to 4 apts over 48 years within neighborhood 17140 of Township Evanston." One sale related to the subject property in November 2003 sale for \$310,000. The remaining 19 properties sold between February 1991 and May 2009 for prices ranging from \$55,000 to \$500,000. No other descriptive data was submitted for purposes of analyzing these properties.

Additionally attached to the board of review's data was a "Board of Review Analysis/Evidence Sheet" with one comparable sale of \$425,000 that occurred in July 2007, described as 40 years old and containing 2,303 square feet 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 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 contends 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 of the subject property or comparable sales. (86 Ill.Admin.Code 1910.65(c)). A contemporaneous sale between two parties dealing at arm's length is not only relevant to the question of fair cash value but practically conclusive on the issue on whether the assessment is reflective of market value. Korzen v. Belt Railway Co. of Chicago, 37 Ill.2d 158 (1967). After an analysis of the evidence in the record, the Board finds the appellant has met this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The Board finds the board of review does not sufficiently refute the appellant's overvaluation argument due to comparable #4 2006 and comparable #3 2007 sale date when compared to the 2009 sale of the subject property. The Board finds the best evidence of market value in the record is the sale of the subject property in May 2009 for a price of \$285,000. The subject's total assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$427,674, which is greater than its purchase price. The Board finds the board of review provided no evidence to indicate that the subject's sale was not an arm's length transaction. Based on this record the Board finds the subject had a market value of \$285,000 as of the January 1, 2009 assessment date. Based on this evidence the Board finds a reduction to the subject's assessment equivalent to the appellant's request is appropriate.

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

*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: June 22, 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.