



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

APPELLANT: Jan Cheng
DOCKET NO.: 11-02459.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 08-28-419-013

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Jan Cheng, the appellant, and the DuPage 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 DuPage County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$37,490
IMPR: \$71,905
TOTAL: \$109,395

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property is improved with a two-story single-family dwelling of frame and masonry exterior construction containing 2,293 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1993. Features of the home include an unfinished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace and an attached garage of 420 square feet of building area. The property is located in Naperville, Lisle Township, DuPage 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 April 1, 2011 for a price of \$330,000. The appellant completed Section IV - Recent Sale Data of the appeal disclosing the property was purchased from Yu-Shu Pai and sold using a Realtor from Concentric Realty, agent David Phua, the property had been advertised on the open market

through the Multiple Listing Service and it had been on the market for 205 days.

In further support of the transaction the appellant submitted a copy of the Multiple Listing Service data sheet depicting the listing date of July 16, 2010 and an asking price of \$369,000 and a subsequent price reduction to \$359,000, prior to the sale of the property to the appellant for \$330,000. The document also depicts that the contract was entered into on February 5, 2011 and that the closing occurred on April 1, 2011. A copy of the Settlement Statement also reiterates the sale date and purchase price as previously reported and also reflects the payment of brokers' commissions related to the sale.

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to reflect the purchase price at the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeals" wherein the subject's total assessment of \$119,040 was disclosed. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$359,095 or \$156.60 per square foot of living area, including land, when applying the 2011 three year average median level of assessment for DuPage County of 33.15% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In support of the assessment the board of review submitted its Addendum to Board of Review Notes on Appeal along with Exhibit 1 consisting of a spreadsheet that included sales along with a parcel map depicting the location of the subject and the comparable properties. The spreadsheet indicates it was prepared by John D. Trowbridge II, Lisle Township Assessor. The grid also depicts the subject's purchase price of \$330,000 with a date of March 2011.

The spreadsheet sets forth information on eight comparable sales located in the same neighborhood code assigned by the assessor as the subject property. The comparables are improved with dwellings of frame construction that range in size from 1,917 to 2,293 square feet of living area. The dwellings were constructed in 1993. Features of the comparables include a full or partial basement, one of which is partially finished. Six of the homes have central air conditioning and each has a fireplace and an attached garage of 420 square feet of building area. These comparables sold from September 1998 to November 2010 for prices ranging from \$246,000 to \$347,000 or from \$107.28 to \$169.54 per square foot of living area, including land.

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. Except in counties with more than 200,000 inhabitants that classify property, property is to be valued at 33 1/3% of fair cash value. (35 ILCS 200/9-145(a)). 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). Furthermore, the sale of a property during the tax year in question is a relevant factor in considering the validity of the assessment. Rosewell v. 2626 Lakeview Limited Partnership, 120 Ill.App.3d 369, 375 (1st Dist. 1983). 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 purchase of the subject property on April 1, 2011 for a price of \$330,000. The appellant provided evidence demonstrating the sale had the elements of an arm's length transaction. the property was purchased from Yu-Shu Pai and sold using a Realtor

from Concentric Realty, agent David Phua, the property had been advertised on the open market through the Multiple Listing Service and it had been on the market for 205 days. In addition, the board of review did not present any evidence to challenge the arm's length nature of the subject's sale transaction and in fact reported the sale of the subject in its own grid analysis.

The Property Tax Appeal Board further finds the purchase price of \$330,000 is below the market value reflected by the assessment of \$359,095. Moreover, the eight comparables sales presented by the board of review fail to support the subject's total estimated market value as reflected by its assessment where the recent sales range from \$246,000 to \$347,000.

The board of review also did not refute the contention that the purchase price of the subject was reflective of market value at the time of the sale. Lastly, the Board finds the recent comparable sales presented by the board of review support the appellant's assertion that the subject is overvalued based on its assessment and, furthermore, the sales support the assertion that the subject's purchase price of \$330,000 was within the range of these recent comparable sales given the subject's superior size when compared to the comparable sales. The Board has given no weight to comparable sales #4 through #8 as these sales occurred between September 1998 and August 2003, dates too remote in time to be indicative of the subject's estimated market value as of the assessment date of January 1, 2011. Sales #1 and #2 support the conclusion that the subject is overvalued as these slightly smaller dwellings sold in August and November 2010 for prices of \$310,000 and \$325,000, respectively. Less weight was given to comparable #3 as it sold in September 2009 and is not as proximate in time to the assessment date.

In conclusion, based on this record the Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$330,000 as of January 1, 2011. Since market value has been determined the 2011 three year average median level of assessment for DuPage County of 33.15% 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.