

PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD'S DECISION

APPELLANT: Ramo Durakovic  
DOCKET NO.: 03-22794.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 11-29-320-056-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Ramo Durakovic, the appellant, by attorney William J. Seitz with the law firm of Fisk Kart Katz and Regan, Ltd. in Chicago, and the Cook County Board of Review.

The subject property consists of a 31-year-old, two-story, masonry constructed, walk-up apartment building containing a total of eight units, three one-bedroom units and five two-bedroom units. The subject contains a total building area of 7,718 square feet, is situated on a 7,200 square foot parcel and is located in Rogers Park Township, Cook County.

The appellant, through counsel, submitted evidence before the Property Tax Appeal Board claiming that the subject's market value is not accurately reflected in its assessment. The appellant argued that the income generated by the subject does not warrant its high level of taxation, and therefore its excessive assessment.

In support of the request for relief due to the subject's diminished income, the appellant's attorney prepared and submitted an "income approach", using the subject's actual income and expenses. The evidence disclosed the subject property's net income to be \$22,471. Applying a capitalization rate of 16.11% produced a market value for the subject of \$139,485. A factor of 30%, which represents the Cook County Real Property Classification level of assessment for Class 3 property, was applied to determine a requested total assessment for the subject of \$41,845. Also, the board of review's decision disclosing the subject's final assessment of \$87,119 for 2003 was presented.

(Continued on Next Page)

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: \$ 14,459  
IMPR.: \$ 72,660  
TOTAL: \$ 87,119

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

PTAB/rfd5036

In contrast, the board of review did not submit its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" or any evidence in support of its assessed valuation of the subject property. Consequently, by letter of April 6, 2007, the board of review was notified of being found in default.

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 fails to support a reduction in the subject's assessment.

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, 728 N.E.2d 1256 (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. Section 1910.65 *The Official Rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board* (86 Ill.Adm.Code §1910.65(c)).

The Board finds the appellant's argument that the subject's assessment is excessive when applying an income approach based on the subject's actual income and expenses unconvincing and not supported by evidence in the record. In Springfield Marine Bank v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 44 Ill.2d 428 (1970), the court stated:

[I]t is the value of the "tract or lot of real property" clearly which is assessed, rather than the value of the interest presently held. . . [R]ental income may of course be a relevant factor. However, it cannot be the controlling factor, particularly where it is admittedly misleading as to the fair cash value of the property involved. . . [E]arning capacity is properly regarded as the most significant element in arriving at "fair cash value". . . Many factors may prevent a property owner from realizing an income from property, which accurately reflects its true earning capacity; but it is the capacity for earning income, rather than the income actually derived, which reflects "fair cash value" for taxation purposes." Springfield Marine Bank v. Property Tax Appeal Board 44 Ill.2d 428 at 430-431.

Actual expenses and income can be useful when shown that they are reflective of the market. The appellant did not demonstrate that

the subject's actual income and expenses were reflective of the market. To demonstrate or estimate the subject's market value using an income approach, as the appellant attempted, one must establish through the use of market data the market rent, vacancy and collection losses, and expenses to arrive at a net operating income. Further, the appellant must establish through the use of market data a capitalization rate to convert the net income into an estimate of market value. The appellant failed to follow this procedure in developing the income approach to value; therefore, the Property Tax Appeal Board gives this argument no weight.

Although the board of review failed to provide any evidence in support of the subject's current assessment, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds the appellant has failed to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the subject property is overvalued. Therefore, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that no reduction in the subject's assessment is 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.



Chairman



Member



Member



Member



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: December 7, 2007



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.