



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

APPELLANT: Kevin Russell  
DOCKET NO.: 12-21560.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 28-14-403-017-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Kevin Russell, the appellant; 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:** \$ 2,037  
**IMPR.:** \$ 16,587  
**TOTAL:** \$ 18,624

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property consists of a 13,585 square foot parcel of land improved with a 13-year old, two-story, frame, single-family dwelling. Amenities include: 1,900 square feet of living area, two full and one half-baths, a full basement, 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 Thomas Carroll of Wyma Appraisal Services, Inc. The appraisal indicated an estimated market value of \$129,000 with an effective date of October 10, 2012. The appraisal also stated that no home inspection was undertaken, but that a plat of survey signed and dated on August 10, 2007 reflected the subject to be a one and one-half story building. 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 three properties as well as reporting on two properties listed for sale described as single-family dwellings. The sale properties sold from January to July, 2012, for prices ranging from \$56.41 to \$70.71 per square foot of living area. The appraisal stated that two of the three sales were considered short sales. 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 \$129,000.

Further, the appellant's pleadings indicated that the subject was purchased in July, 2011, for \$125,000. The pleadings indicated: that the property was advertised for sale on the open market; that the buyer and the seller were not related parties; and that the seller's mortgage was not assumed. However, the appellant stated that the purchase was a short sale.

At hearing, the appellant testified that the subject is actually a one and one-half story building based upon statements from his appraiser that the subject had vaulted ceilings. He stated that the appraisal's interior and exterior photographs accurately depict the subject as of the assessment date of January 1, 2012. He also pointed out that the front of the house depicts a pitched roof which spans the width of the home. 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 \$18,624 was disclosed. The subject's final assessment reflects a fair market value of \$192,198 or \$101.16 per square foot when the Illinois Department of Revenue's 2012 three-year median level of assessment of 9.69% 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 four properties suggested as comparable. The properties are described as two-story, frame or frame and masonry, single-family dwellings. The properties range in improvement size from 1,380 to 1,975 square feet of living area and in improvement

assessments from \$6.11 to \$11.41 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment is \$8.73 per square foot.

Moreover, the properties sold from June, 2010, to June, 2011, for prices that ranged from \$94.68 to \$129.27 per square foot of living area. The board of review's representative testified that there was no evidence to support that these 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 testified that he is familiar with his neighborhood and that his appraisal's properties #1 and #2 are located less than one mile's distance from the subject. In addition, upon review of the board of review's properties, the appellant testified that those properties are located within the subject's neighborhood.

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 (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 market value evidence presented, the Board finds that the appellant did not meet this burden and that a reduction is not warranted.

As to the subject's improvement style and size, the Board finds that the plat of survey, numerous photographs, along with the appellant's testimony indicate that the subject is a one and one-half story residence with 1,900 square feet of living area.

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 (1<sup>st</sup> 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 seven suggested comparables. The Board finds appellant's sale #1 as well as the board of review's sales #1 and #3 the most probative. These sales occurred from June, 2010, to February,

2012, for unadjusted prices ranging from \$70.71 to \$129.27 per square foot of living area. In comparison, the appellant's assessment reflects a market value of \$101.16 per square foot of living area which is within the range established by the sales comparables. After considering adjustments and the differences in the comparables when compared to the subject, 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.