



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

APPELLANT: David & Alecia Wartowski
DOCKET NO.: 09-23332.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 10-14-103-047-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are David & Alecia Wartowski, the appellant(s); 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: \$7,270
IMPR.: \$30,555
TOTAL: \$37,825

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of a 7,860 square foot parcel of land improved with a 55 year old, two-story, masonry, single-family dwelling. The subject includes two and one-half baths, a full finished basement, two fireplaces, and a two-car garage. The appellant argued that the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in its assessed value.

In support of this market value argument, the appellant submitted a copy of the Real Estate Contract, Real Estate Transfer Declaration, and a copy of the Settlement Statement stating that the subject property sold for \$425,000.00 on July 6, 2009. The second page of the Settlement Statement itemizes broker fees. The appellant also asserts on the petition that the subject was on the market for 81 days, listed on the multiple listing service, and was not purchased by related parties.

In addition, the appellant submitted a copy of the lender's appraisal that was prepared for the purchase of the subject property. The appraisal was undertaken by David K. Lewellyan of County Appraisals, Inc. The appraiser indicated the subject has an estimated market value of \$450,000 as of May 31, 2009. The appraisal report utilized the sales comparison approach to value to estimate the market value for the subject property. The appraisal report included interior and exterior photographs of the subject's improvement and comparables, location map, and a

diagram of the subject's floor plan. The appraisal finds highest and best use in its present use.

The appraisal stated that the subject was improved with a 58 year old, masonry, two-story, single-family dwelling containing 2,559 square feet of living area. The dwelling is in overall good condition.

Under the sales comparison approach, the appraiser analyzed the sale of six, two-story, masonry single-family dwellings located within the subject's market. The properties contain between 1,768 and 3,407 square feet of living area. The comparables sold from December 2008 to May 2009 for prices ranging from \$410,000 to \$640,000 or from \$176.64 to \$246.91 per square foot of living area. The remaining two comparables were not sold and actively listed for a \$475,000 and \$539,000. Based on the similarities and differences of the comparables when compared to the subject, the appraiser estimated that the value for the subject under the sales comparison approach is \$450,000.

In addition, the appellant also argued that the board of review's property size of 3,064 square feet of living area is incorrect. The appellant cites the appraisal's square footage of 2,559 as an accurate reflection of the subject property's size. The appraisal included a building sketch which outlined the size for the first and second floor of the property.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's total assessment of \$62,514 was disclosed. This assessment reflects a market value of \$702,404 using the Illinois Department of Revenue's 2009 three-year median level of assessment for class 2 property of 8.90%. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted descriptions and assessment information for four properties located within the subject's neighborhood. These properties are described as two-story, frame and masonry, single-family dwellings with between two and two and two-half baths, full finished basement, and two or three fireplaces. The properties range: in age from 53 to 56 years old; in size from 2,338 to 2,448 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$20.82 to \$24.08 per square foot of living area. The board of review asserts the subject contains 3,064 square feet of living area without further information. 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 that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal. 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 (3d Dist. 2002; Winnbago County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 313 Ill.App.3d (2d 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 evidence indicates a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value is the sale of the subject in July 2009 for \$425,000 as evidenced by the sales contract and the settlement statement. The Board finds the settlement statement, line 703, shows a commission was paid to a broker at closing and that the property was on the market for 81 days, listed on the multiple listing service, and not purchased by related parties. This supports the arm's length nature of the sale. The subject's assessment reflects a market value greater than this purchase price. In addition, the square footage as cited in the appraisal shall be deemed correct.

Based on this record, the PTAB finds that the subject property has a market value of \$425,000.00 for the 2009 assessment year. Since market value has been determined, the 2009 three-year median level of assessment for class 2 property as established by the Illinois Department of Revenue of 8.90% shall apply and 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: April 20, 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.