



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

APPELLANT: Tyiase Hasan
DOCKET NO.: 11-29772.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 31-17-306-006-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Tyiase Hasan, the appellant, by attorney Tyiase Hiroshi Hasan in Park Forest; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds no change 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: \$ 3,160
IMPR.: \$ 12,940
TOTAL: \$ 16,100

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of a 8,427 square foot parcel of land improved with a 36-year old, two-story, frame and masonry, single-family dwelling. Amenities include: 1,907 square feet of living area, one full and one half-baths, one fireplace and a two-car garage. The appellant argued that the fair market value of the subject was not accurately reflected in its assessed value as the basis of the appeal.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted an appraisal undertaken by James Sloan of Accurate Services, Inc. The appraisal indicated an estimated market value of \$105,000 with an effective date of January 1, 2011. The appraisal report utilized the sales comparison approach to value to estimate the market value for the subject property.

Under the sales comparison approach, the appraiser analyzed the sales of six properties located within a one-mile radius of the subject. The sale properties sold from April to November, 2010, for prices ranging from \$44.76 to \$85.30 per square foot of living area. The improvements ranged in age from 33 to 38 years and in size from 1,735 to 2,312 square feet of living area. The appraisal disclosed that sale #1 was considered a short sale. The appraiser adjusted each of the comparables for pertinent factors. Based on the similarities and differences of the comparables when compared to the subject, the appraiser estimated a value for the subject under the sales comparison approach of \$105,000.

At hearing, the appellant's attorney argued that the subject's improvement is of non-average condition; thereby, the assessment should be reduced to reflect this condition. He indicated that he is also thoroughly aware of the poor condition of the improvement because he resides in the home with his mother, who has been living there since June, 1993.

In support of the property's poor condition, he indicated that the numerous color photographs of the subject's interior and exterior submitted in the appraisal accurately depict the condition of the subject as of the assessment date at issue. The photographs reflect: pictures of main rooms; a picture of a bathroom with comments of missing tile and/or possible mold; a picture of a room entitled bedroom without any floor covering; a picture of a staircase with worn carpeting; a picture of another bedroom with a broken door; a picture of stained hallway carpeting; a picture of peeling exterior paint along a window; a picture of torn or missing screens; a picture of peeling paint on a garage door; a picture of an exterior wall with a missing light fixture; and a picture of front steps with cracked cement. Based upon this evidence and testimony, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's final assessment of \$16,100 was disclosed. The subject's final assessment reflects a fair market value of \$169,652 or \$88.96 per square foot when the Illinois Department of Revenue's 2011 three-year median level of assessment of 9.49% for Cook County Class 2 properties is applied.

In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review presented descriptions, assessment and limited sales data on three properties suggested as comparable. The properties are

described as two-story, frame or frame and masonry, single-family dwellings of average condition. The properties range: in age from 18 to 41 years; in improvement size from 1,758 to 1,984 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$6.46 to \$8.49 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment is \$6.79 per square foot.

Moreover, the properties sold from February, 2010, to October, 2011, for prices that ranged from \$100.68 to \$106.49 per square foot of living area.

The board of review's representative testified that the board of review is not tasked in determining a property's condition, but that the county assessor has a staff of inspectors that can inspect various properties. He stated that the board of review will rely on an appraisal with photographs to depict a diminished condition of a property as well as submitted sale comparables.

He testified that he has no personal knowledge of the distinguishing characteristics of average or below average condition for a building. Further, he stated that he had neither personal knowledge that a market value determination should be made after a building inspection nor whether an inspection had been undertaken at the subject property. Moreover, he testified that there was no evidence to support that the board of review's sales were arm's length transactions. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

At hearing, the board of review's representative, Joe Powers, raised an objection to the appellant's appraisal because the appraiser was not present at the hearing to testify or be cross-examined; and therefore, he argued that the appraisal is hearsay. Also on this point, Powers requested that the Board not consider the raw sales data within the appraisal due to the lack of data regarding whether the sales were an arm's length transaction. Moreover, Powers requested the Board to take judicial notice of a Board decision on similar issues, while submitting a courtesy copy of said decision. Based upon this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

In rebuttal, the appellant's attorney asserted that the subject was inaccurately assessed due to the absence of the subject's inspection which could distinguish between below average and

average condition of a building, which is designated by the county assessor.

After reviewing the evidence and considering the testimony and/or arguments, 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 (3rd Dist. 2002); Winnebago County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 313 Ill.App.3d 179 (2nd 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 market value evidence presented, the Board finds that the appellant did not meet this burden and that a reduction is not warranted.

Initially, the appellant argues that the subject's market value should be diminished due to the poor condition of the building. In support of this argument, the appellant's attorney refers to the numerous photographs of the subject's interior and exterior with noted condition, at times, from the appellant's appraisal. Many of the subject's photographs depict different rooms of the building without any flaws, while other photographs note items of deferred maintenance that have gone uncured, such as: missing bathroom tiles, torn screens, chipping paint, or cracked concrete. Beyond mere façade maintenance, the appellant submitted neither evidence nor expert testimony regarding structural flaws in the subject's building which could diminish its condition. Therefore, the Board finds this argument unpersuasive.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board looks to the evidence and testimony presented by the parties.

The appellant's appraiser was not present at hearing to testify as to his qualifications, identify his work, testify about the contents of the evidence, the conclusions or be cross-examined by the board of review and the Board. In Novicki v. Department of Finance, 373 Ill.342, 26 N.E.2d 130 (1940), the Supreme Court of Illinois stated, "[t]he rule against hearsay evidence, that a witness may testify only as to facts within his personal

knowledge and not as to what someone else told him, is founded on the necessity of an opportunity for cross-examination, and is basic and not a technical rule of evidence." Novicki, 373 Ill. at 344. In Oak Lawn Trust & Savings Bank v. City of Palos Heights, 115 Ill.App.3d 887, 450 N.E.2d 788, 71 Ill.Dec. 100 (1st Dist. 1983) the appellate court held that the admission of an appraisal into evidence prepared by an appraiser not present at the hearing was in error. The appellate court found the appraisal to be hearsay that did not come within any exception to the hearsay rule, thus inadmissible against the defendant, and the circuit court erred in admitting the appraisal into evidence. Id.

In Jackson v. Board of Review of the Department of Labor, 105 Ill.2d 501, 475 N.E.2d 879, 86 Ill.Dec. 500 (1985), the Supreme Court of Illinois held that the hearsay evidence rule applies to the administrative proceedings under the Unemployment Insurance Act. The court stated, however, hearsay evidence that is admitted without objection may be considered by the administrative body and by the courts on review. Jackson 105 Ill.2d at 509. In the instant case, the board of review has objected to the appraisal as hearsay. Therefore, the Board finds the appraisal hearsay and the adjustments and conclusions of value are given no weight. However, the Board will consider the raw sales data submitted by the parties.

In totality, the parties submitted raw, unadjusted sales data on nine suggested comparables. The Board finds appellant's sales #1, #2 and #4 as well as the board of review's sale #3 the most probative. These sales occurred from June, 2010, to October, 2011, for unadjusted prices ranging from \$44.76 to \$105.85 per square foot of living area. In comparison, the appellant's assessment reflects a market value of \$88.96 per square foot of living area which is within the range established by the sale comparables. After considering adjustments and the differences in the comparables when compared to the subject including condition, the Board finds the subject's per square foot assessment is supported and a reduction is not 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.

Ronald R. Cuit

Chairman

K. L. Fern

Member

Tracy 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: January 23, 2015

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.