



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

APPELLANT: Allegra Smith  
DOCKET NO.: 09-30758.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 29-09-413-043-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Allegra Smith, the appellant; 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:** \$ 4,877  
**IMPR:** \$ 22,624  
**TOTAL:** \$ 27,501

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property consists of 15,007 square feet of land improved with a three-year old, two-story, frame and masonry, single-family dwelling. The improvement includes 4,233 square feet of living area as well as a full basement, three full baths, one fireplace, and a three-car garage. The subject's site is located in Thornton Township.

The appellant argued that the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in the property's assessed valuation as the basis of this appeal.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted a residential appraisal summary report of the subject property with an effective date of September 16, 2010 undertaken by Bodie Proffitt, who holds the designation of Associate Residential Appraiser as well as T. J. McCarthy, who holds the designation of Certified Real Estate Appraiser. The appraisers estimated a market value for the subject of \$309,000, while developing a land value and sales comparison approach to value.

The appraisal stated that the subject was improved with a detached, single-family dwelling in existing construction and in

average condition. The appraisal indicated that the subject's actual age and effective age was eight years. Under the cost approach, the appraisers estimated the site value at \$38,000.

Under the sales comparison approach to value, the appraisers utilized three sale comparables located in the suburb of South Holland, as is the subject. In support of this, the appraisal included a map of the subject's area with the location of the suggested comparables identified thereon. The comparables sold from December, 2009, through August, 2009, for prices that ranged from \$223,000 to \$300,000, or from \$70.84 to \$92.72 per square foot. The properties were improved with a two-story, masonry and frame, single-family dwelling, while the appraiser determined that they were in good or average condition. The properties ranged: in bathrooms from two full and one half-baths to three full baths; in actual age from eight to 12 years; in improvement size from 2,405 to 4,235 square feet of living area; and in land size from 11,487 to 16,392 square feet of land. Each property also included a full basement, one or two fireplaces, and a three-car garage. After making adjustments to the suggested comparables, the appraiser estimated the subject's market value was \$309,000. Based upon this data, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's market value.

The board of review submitted "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's total assessment was \$40,442. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$454,405 using the Illinois Department of Revenue median level of assessment for class 2, residential property of 8.90% for tax year 2009.

The board also submitted descriptive and assessment data on three suggested equity comparables. These properties ranged in land size from 14,252 to 16,139 square feet. They were improved with a three-year old, two-story, frame and masonry, single-family dwelling. The improvements ranged: in bathrooms from three full baths to three full and one half-baths; in size from 3,911 to 4,235 square feet of living area; and in improvements assessments from \$8.40 to \$9.37 per square foot of living area. Amenities include a full basement, a three-car garage, and one fireplace.

In addition, the grid analysis indicated that property #2 sold in February, 2007, for a price of \$511,500 or \$120.78 per square foot. As a result of its analysis, the board requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

After considering the arguments and reviewing 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 (3<sup>rd</sup> Dist. 2002); Winnebago County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 313 Ill.App.3d 179 (2<sup>nd</sup> 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 appellant has met this burden and that a reduction is warranted.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board finds the best evidence to be the appellant's appraisal. The Board finds this appraisal to be persuasive for the appraisers personally inspected the subject property and undertook two of the three traditional approaches to value in estimating the subject's market value. Moreover, they utilized market data to obtain improved sale comparables while providing sufficient detail regarding each sale as well as appropriate adjustments where necessary.

Further, the Board finds that the board of review's evidence fails to indicate that the sales data relating to property #2 reflected an arm's length transaction.

Therefore, the Board finds that the subject property contained a market value of \$309,000 for tax year 2009. Since the market value of the subject has been established, the median level of assessment as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue for class 2, residential property of 8.90% will apply. In applying this level of assessment to the subject, the total assessed value is \$27,501, while the subject's current total assessed value is above this amount at \$40,442. Therefore, the Board finds that 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.



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: September 21, 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.