



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

APPELLANT: Lillie J. Kinnard  
DOCKET NO.: 09-31349.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 29-26-202-002-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Lillie J. Kinnard, the appellant, by attorney Brian S. Maher of Weis, DuBrock, Doody & Maher in 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** \$2,790  
**IMPR.:** \$4,508  
**TOTAL:** \$7,298

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a multi-level dwelling of frame and masonry construction. The dwelling is approximately 42 years old and contains 1,440 square feet of living area. Features of the home include a partial finished basement, central air conditioning, and a two-car garage. The subject property is located in South Holland, Thornton Township, Cook County.

The appellant's appeal is based on overvaluation. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased on February 19, 2009, for a price of \$82,000 or \$56.94 per square foot of living area, land included. The evidence also shows that the subject property was the subject matter of an appeal before the Property Tax Appeal Board the prior year under docket number 08-28003.001-R-1. In that appeal, the Property Tax Appeal Board rendered a decision lowering the assessment of the subject property to \$7,872 based upon the evidence submitted by the parties.

In support of the overvaluation argument, the appellant submitted evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased on February 19, 2009, for a price of \$82,000 or \$56.94 per square

foot of living area, land included. The appellant partially completed Section IV - Recent Sale Data of the residential appeal form and disclosed the name of the seller; that the subject's sale was not a transfer between related parties; and that the seller's mortgage was not assumed. To further document the sale, the appellant submitted a copy of the settlement statement, HUD-1, disclosing the subject property was purchased on February 19, 2009 for a price of \$82,000 and that two realty firms were involved in the sale transaction. In a letter dated October 4, 2010, the appellant's attorney described the sale of the subject property as an "arms length transaction" and asked that the subject's assessment be reduced to \$7,790.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein its final assessment of the subject totaling \$15,910 was disclosed. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$178,764 or \$124.14 per square foot of living area, land included, using the 2009 three year average median level of assessments for class 2 property in Cook County of 8.90% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue. (86 Ill.Admin.Code 1910.50(c)(2)).

In support of the assessment, the board of review submitted information on four equity comparables, one of which was a sale. The property that sold, comparable #4, is a multi-level dwelling of frame and masonry construction. The property has the same assigned neighborhood code as the subject and is located one-quarter mile from the subject. Comparable #4's dwelling is 40 years old and contains 1,433 square feet of living area with a partial finished basement, central air conditioning, and a two-car garage. Comparable #4 sold in July 2006 for a price of \$140,000 or for \$97.70 per square foot of living area, land included. On the grid analysis, the board of review made reference to a prior sale of the subject property. The subject property sold in January 2006 for a price of \$220,000 or for \$152.78 per square foot of living area, land included. The board of review also submitted a list of twenty properties that sold from 1990 to 2007 for prices ranging from \$60,000 to \$225,000. Descriptive evidence for the twenty sale properties was not provided. The list included two prior sales of the subject property. Besides the January 2006 sale discussed above, the subject property also sold in December 2000 for a price of \$151,000 or for \$104.86 per square foot of living area, land included. 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. The Board further finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The appellant contends the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in its assessed valuation. Fair cash value is defined in the Property Tax Code as "[t]he amount for which a property can be sold in the due course of business and

trade, not under duress, between a willing buyer and a willing seller." (35 ILCS 200/1-50). The Supreme Court of Illinois has construed "fair cash value" to mean what the property would bring at a voluntary sale where the owner is ready, willing, and able to sell but not compelled to do so, and the buyer is ready, willing, and able to buy but not forced to do so. Springfield Marine Bank v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 44 Ill.2d 428 (1970). 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). 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); 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). 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 appellant met this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value in the record is the sale of the subject property on February 19, 2009, for a price of \$82,000. In a letter dated October 4, 2010, the appellant's attorney described the subject's sale as an "arms length transaction". In the residential appeal form, the appellant disclosed the name of the seller; that the subject's sale was not a transfer between related parties; and that the seller's mortgage was not assumed. The appellant also submitted a copy of the settlement statement which disclosed that two realty firms were involved in the sale transaction. The subject property has an assessment of \$15,910 that reflects a market value of \$178,764. The Board finds the subject's purchase price is less than the market value reflected by the assessment.

The Board finds the board of review did not present any evidence to challenge the arm's length nature of the transaction or to refute the contention that the purchase price was reflective of market value. Although the board of review submitted four equity comparables, the Board gives no weight to the board of review's equity evidence as it is not responsive to the appellant's overvaluation argument. The Board also gives no weight to the board of review's market value evidence. Although the board of review submitted a sale price for one of its comparables, this sale occurred in July 2006 which was not as proximate to the January 1, 2009 assessment date as the February 2009 sale of the subject property relied on by the appellant. The Board also gives no weight to the board of review's listing of sale properties. These sales lacked the descriptive evidence that would have helped to determine how similar they were to the subject property.

Based on this record the Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$82,000 as of January 1, 2009. Since market

Docket No: 09-31349.001-R-1

value has been determined the 2009 three year average median level of assessments for class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance of 8.90% shall apply. (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(c)(2)).

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: September 20, 2013

*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.