



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

APPELLANT: John Doherty
DOCKET NO.: 11-01543.001-R-2
PARCEL NO.: 03-16-203-002

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are John Doherty, the appellant, by attorney Laura Godek of Laura Moore Godek, PC, McHenry; and the Kane 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 Kane County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$41,857
IMPR: \$137,585
TOTAL: \$179,442

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property is improved with a two-story dwelling of brick and stone construction containing approximately 4,101 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 2005. Features of the home include an unfinished walk-out basement, central air conditioning, three fireplaces and a four-car attached garage. The property has a 27,878 square foot site and is located in Carpentersville, Dundee Township, Kane County.

The appellant is contesting the assessment for the 2011 tax year based on overvaluation. In support of this argument the appellant submitted information on 23 comparable sales described as being improved with 1 one-story dwelling and 22 two-story dwellings that range in size from 2,287 to 4,281 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 3 to 33 years old. The evidence disclosed 20 of the comparables were located from .3 to 6.4 miles from the subject property. Each comparable has a basement with 13 having finished living area. Each comparable also has central air conditioning and 22 comparables had 1, 2 or 3 fireplaces. Three comparables have a two-car garage and twenty comparables have a three-car garage. The comparables

have sites ranging in size from 7,821 to 140,001 square feet of land area. The comparables sold from October 2009 to February 2012 for prices ranging from \$255,000 to \$459,000 or from \$72.17 to \$135.55 per square foot of living area, including land.

In further support of their overvaluation argument the appellant submitted an appraisal estimating the subject property had a market value of \$540,000 as of January 1, 2010. The appraisal was prepared by Bradford W. Meador, a State of Illinois certified real estate appraiser. In estimating the market value of the subject property the appraiser developed the cost and the sales comparison approaches to value.

Under the cost approach the appraiser estimated the subject had a site value of \$90,000. The appraiser estimated the replacement cost new of the improvements to be \$528,800. The appraiser estimated depreciation to be \$16,287 resulting in a depreciated improvement value of \$512,513. The appraiser also estimated the site improvements had an "as-is" value of \$5,000. Adding the various components, the appraiser estimated the subject property had an estimated market value under the cost approach to value of \$607,513.

Using the sales comparison approach the appraiser provided information on five comparable sales described as two-story dwellings that ranged in size from 2,472 to 4,018 square feet of living area. The dwellings ranged in age from 2 to 22 years old. Each of the comparables had a basement with three being finished. Each comparable had central air conditioning, one or two fireplaces and a 2, 3 or 4-car garage. The comparables have sites ranging in size from .22 to 1.4 acres of land area and were located from .57 to 4.34 miles from the subject property. The comparables sold from May 2009 to November 2009 for prices ranging from \$349,000 to \$530,000 or from \$86.86 to \$199.84 per square foot of living area, including land. After making adjustments to the comparables for differences from the subject the appraiser estimated the comparables had adjusted prices ranging from \$454,735 to \$564,975. Based on this data the appraiser estimated the subject had an indicated value under the sales comparison approach of \$540,000.

In reconciling the two approaches to value the appraiser estimated the subject property had a market value of \$540,000 as of January 1, 2010. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to \$90,301.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's total assessment of \$193,314 was disclosed. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$581,745 or \$141.85 per square foot of living area, including land, when applying the 2011 three year average median level of assessment for Kane County of 33.23% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment of the subject property the board of review submitted information on three comparable sales identified by the township assessor. The comparable sales are improved with two-story dwellings that ranged in size from 3,864 to 4,092 square feet of living area. The dwellings were constructed in 2003 and 2005. Each comparable has a basement, central air conditioning, one or two fireplaces and a garage ranging in size from 732 to 927 square feet of building area. The comparables have sites ranging in size from approximately 16,117 to 25,264 square feet of land area. The comparables sold from July 2010 to September 2012 for prices ranging from \$530,000 to \$550,000 or from \$134.41 to \$137.16 per square foot of living area, including land.

In rebuttal the assessor identified 15 of the appellant's comparable sales as "tract housing" and not a good basis of comparison. The assessor also asserted that comparable #4 is a one-story home; sale #5 was much smaller; comparables #16, #17, #18, #19 and #20 are not located in Kane County; and comparable #7 is older and smaller. The township assessor also asserted that the appraisal comparables had adjustments of over 25% and are not located in the township or county.

Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the assessment.

In rebuttal the appellant asserted that the Property Tax Appeal Board issued a decision in Docket No. 10-01814.001-R-1 reducing the subject's assessment to \$180,144 and the assessor had not presented any evidence that the subject's assessment had increased. The appellant also argued the amenities and the upgrades on the listing sheets indicate the appellant's comparables are not inferior to the subject. The appellant also commented on the three sales presented by the board of review.

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 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 (3rd 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 to be the appraisal of the subject property submitted by the appellant estimating the subject property had a market value of \$540,000 or \$131.68 per square foot of living area, including land, as of January 1, 2010. The appellant's appraiser developed the cost and sales comparison approaches to value and gave most weight to the conclusion of value contained in the sales comparison approach. The appraised value is also supported by the best comparable sales identified by the appellant with respect to style, size, age and date of sale, which include appellant's sales #2, #3, #16, #20, and #23, as well as the board of review comparable sales. These properties sold from May 2010 to September 2012 for prices ranging from \$290,000 to \$550,000 or from \$72.17 to \$137.16 per square foot of living area, including land. The Board finds the subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$581,745 or \$141.85 per square foot of living area, including land, which is above the appraised value and above the range established by the best sales in the record. The Board gave less weight to the remaining sales submitted by the appellant due to differences from the subject in such items as size, age, style and location. Based on this record the Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$540,000 as of January 1, 2011. Since market value has been determined the 2010 three year average median level of assessment for Kane County of 33.23% shall apply. (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(c)(1)).

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

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 18, 2014

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.