



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

APPELLANT: Svigos Asset Management
DOCKET NO.: 04-21567.001-C-3 through 04-21567.003-C-3
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Svigos Asset Management, the appellant, by attorney Brian P. Liston, of the Law Offices of Liston & Tsantilis, P.C. in Chicago; the Cook County Board of Review by Assistant Cook County State's Attorney Bill Blyth; and the intervenors, Leyden C.H.S.D. #212 by attorney Ares G. Dalianis of Franczek Radelet P.C. in Chicago and the Village of Franklin Park by attorney Matthew Holmes of Storino Ramello & Durkin in Rosemont.

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:

DOCKET NO	PARCEL NUMBER	LAND	IMPRVMT	TOTAL
04-21567.001-C-3	12-28-300-030-0000	303,050	633,559	\$936,609
04-21567.002-C-3	12-28-300-031-0000	360,710	255,983	\$616,693
04-21567.003-C-3	12-28-132-009-0000	79,097	40,697	\$119,794

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of three parcels totaling 336,370 square feet of land improved with a 30-year-old, one-story, masonry constructed, multi-tenant, retail, strip shopping center containing 59,020 square feet of buildable area. The appellant argued that the fair market value of the subject is not accurately reflected in its assessed value.

At hearing, the PTAB first addressed preliminary matters. The appellant presented a motion to bar the board of review's evidence because the board entered into negotiations with the appellant for a reduced assessed value. Each party was given

leave to make oral arguments on the motion. The PTAB denied the appellant's motion and the board of review's submission remained in evidence.

In support of this market value argument, the appellant submitted a complete, self-contained appraisal of the subject with an effective date of January 1, 2004 and an estimated market value of \$2,000,000.

At hearing, the appellant's first witness was Paul Svigos, the managing owner of the subject property. Mr. Svigos was shown Appellant's Group Exhibit #1, copies of aerial black and white photos of the subject property for 2000, 2004, and 2006. Mr. Svigos testified these pictures accurately depicted the property on the years noted, with the exception of the paved parking near building C in 2000.

Mr. Svigos was then showed Appellant's Group Exhibit #2, copies of aerial black and white photos from the National Flood Insurance Program for Franklin Park and, more specifically, the subject property. Mr. Svigos asserted that approximately half the subject is within a floodplain.

In response to access questions, Mr. Svigos testified that there is poor access from both Grand and Mannheim Avenues into the subject's property. He opined that the traffic is fast and that it's not ideal for a shopping center. He testified that after the subject's purchase in 2000, the parking lot was repaved, new lights replaced the old ones in the parking lot, and a new façade was put on the buildings. He asserted that between 2000 and 2009 the subject underwent approximately \$400,000 in repairs and updating.

Mr. Svigos testified that a member of his family owned the grocery center that was leasing space at the time the subject was purchased by his family. He indicated this was a significant factor in purchasing the property. Mr. Svigos was shown Appellant's Exhibit #3, a copy of the closing statement for the purchase of the subject in 2000. Mr. Svigos testified that at the time of purchase, a phase one environmental study was conducted on the property and eight tanks of heating oil were discovered on the property. He testified that five of the tanks are located within buildings. Mr. Svigos indicated that they are still attempting to receive a no further remediation necessary letter from the government. He testified that approximately \$200,000 has been spent to date on remediation.

Mr. Svigos was shown the Appellant's Exhibit #6, a copy of the appraisal with a valuation date of January 1, 2004. He was directed to the financial statements at the end of the appraisal. Mr. Svigos testified that these documents in the appraisal are income statements kept in the normal course of business. He testified that the subject experienced a 15% vacancy rate for

2004. He asserted that the 2004 taxes had an effect on the vacancy rate of the subject after the bills were sent to the tenants.

Under cross-examination, Mr. Svigos acknowledged that between the purchase of the property in 2000 and 2004 there were significant improvements made to the property. As to remediation, Mr. Svigos testified that approximately \$80,000 of the \$200,000 in costs was done prior to 2004. He stated the outside tanks were removed and the inside tanks were remediated as best as possible. Mr. Svigos testified that the grocery store paid for the majority of repairs on the property.

Mr. Svigos testified there were no turn lanes into the subject property. He also testified the subject property, specifically units D & C, have flooded since taking ownership of the property in 2000.

The appellant's next witness was the appraiser, Joseph M. Ryan. Mr. Ryan testified that he is president of LaSalle Appraisal Group since 1991. He testified prior to this job, he had worked at two appraisal firms and the Cook County Assessor's Office. He indicated that he is an Illinois certified appraiser and holds the designation of a MAI from the Appraisal Institute. Mr. Ryan testified that he has appraised hundreds of retail and commercial properties. Ryan was admitted as an expert in the field of property valuation without objection of the remaining parties.

The appellant's appraisal gave an estimate of market value as of the effective date of January 1, 2004 of \$2,000,000. Ryan testified he conducted a complete inspection on November 11, 2004. Ryan stated he did not develop an income or a cost approach to value.

Ryan testified that the subject property is a four-building strip retail center. He opined the land was an odd configuration. He testified that, while there is exposure Mannheim Road, ownership does not own the corner parcel. In addition, he opined that the out lot building blocks the exposure of the other buildings.

Ryan opined that the highest and best use of the subject as vacant was commercial use and that as improved, its highest and best use would be its current use. He testified that he reviewed the sales history for the subject and determined the property was purchased in August 2000 for \$1,850,000. Ryan testified that the tenants are local credit retailer.

The appellant's appraiser developed the sales comparison approach to value in estimating the subject's market value. Ryan testified he considered all three approaches, but did not develop a cost approach because the property had an effective age of 30 years and had some incurable problems with design and layout of the property. He testified he did not develop an income approach

because about 30% of the property was leased to a tenant that had a relationship with the ownership and that an income approach could be somewhat subjective and misleading. In addition, he opined that the functionality and design of the property calls into question the quantity, quality and durability of the income stream. Ryan testified he did review the income for the subject and stated the vacancy rate for 2004 was approximately 20%.

Ryan testified that, under the sales comparison approach, he examined sales of five commercial properties. He testified that sale #1 was the sale of the subject property in 2000. He stated the owners expended approximately \$185,000 to improve the property between the sale date and 2004.

Ryan testified the comparables were strip shopping centers with some form of functional obsolescence such as an odd configuration or limited exposure to the street. He noted that four of the five comparables had grocers as the anchor tenant.

Ryan testified that comparable #4 subsequently sold. He was presented Appellant's Exhibit #8, a copy of a transfer declaration filing and a supplemental form for suggested comparable #4 showing a sale in January 2004 for \$6,000,000. He testified that because the sale was after the lien date and the transfer declaration filing and supplemental form indicate that the property was part of an exchange and higher than market value, that he would not use this sale as a comparable. Ryan testified he measured this property and the square footage of the building is larger than indicated by the county; that being 92,000 square feet of building area. He was presented with Appellant's Exhibit #9, a copy of a Google maps aerial photo of this comparable. Ryan testified that this map shows a building size of 90,627 square feet. He stated that the difference in size between his measurements and those of the map would not his overall value of the subject.

The comparables range in building size from 31,000 to 92,000 square feet of building area and sold from August 2000 to February 2003 for prices ranging from \$825,000 to \$4,000,000, or from \$26.61 to \$43.48 per square foot of building area, including land. The properties ranged in age from 20 to 30 years and in land to building ratio from 1.80:1 to 5.70:1. Ryan testified he compared and contrasted the comparables to the subject based on several factors and made adjustments. He testified he estimated the value of the subject at \$34.00 per square foot of buildable area, including land. This yields a value for the subject property under the sales comparison approach at \$2,000,000, rounded.

Under cross-examination by the intervenor, Ryan testified that his inspection of the property was done on the day his report was issued. In response to questions concerning case law cited in the appraisal, Ryan testified he reviewed a summary of the case, but

was not familiar with the facts of the case, the approaches used or the prevailing party.

Ryan acknowledged that his definition of market value includes reasonable time for exposure on the open market. He was presented with Intervenor's Exhibit #1, copies of the transfer declaration filing and the trustee's deed for the subject's sale on July 1, 2000. Ryan testified the subject property was not listed with an agent or advertised for sale. He opined that the sale was at market value because it was negotiated.

As to sale #2, Ryan was presented Intervenor's Exhibit #2, a comps detail sheet for this comparable. Ryan testified he used Costar Comps Service for data on sale #2. Ryan acknowledged that the form stated the property was vacant for two years prior to its sale and that he did not have this information in his appraisal. He opined that this sale was evidence of a fee simple market value.

As to sale #3, Ryan was presented Intervenor's Exhibit #3, copies of the transfer declaration filing and the warranty deed for a subsequent sale for this property in May 2002 for \$2,118,400. He acknowledged this sale is an increase of 45% from the previous 2001 sale that he used in his appraisal. Ryan acknowledged the sale information was available to him, but was not included in the appraisal report.

Ryan was presented with Intervenor's Exhibit #4, a copy of a CoStar Comps Service detail sheet for comparable #4, and Intervenor's Exhibit #5, a comps detail sheet printed by Dost Valuation Group for this comparable. Ryan acknowledged the CoStar Comps sheet does indicate that the property sold with deferred maintenance, but it does not indicate the sale was part of a 1031 exchange. He also acknowledged that the transfer declaration does not indicate the sale was an exercise of an option, but that it does list the sale as a fulfillment of a contract. He acknowledged that the buyer made an unsolicited offer for the property; but Ryan opined that once negotiations began, the property was available for other offers and therefore the sale was representative of market value.

Ryan was presented with Intervenor's Exhibit #5, a comps detail sheet for comparable #5 prepared by Dost Valuation Group. Ryan agreed that the property subsequently sold after the lien date for a higher price than the previous sale.

Ryan agreed that the subject was an income producing property and acknowledged that buyers would look at the income generating capacity of a property such as the subject. He reaffirmed that he did not develop an income approach to value for the subject.

On cross-examination by the board of review, Ryan again agreed that the subject is an income producing property and that

potential income would be a concern for an investor. He acknowledged that the appraisal stated that the client requested the scope of the appraisal be limited. He testified he discussed the merits of the three approaches with the client and they opined that the sales comparison approach was the most relevant.

Ryan testified that the subject had vacancy issues and acknowledged that vacancy can arise from poor management. He testified the subject is on a heavily-traveled roadway where there are turning lanes for ingress into the property. He acknowledged the subject has fair access, visibility and is in fair condition.

On re-direct, Ryan opined that the definition of market value is all encompassing and focuses on the buyer and seller acting knowledgeably, prudently and in their own best interest.

As to sale #2, Ryan testified that he used the Costar Comp information, but that he also confirmed the information through the green sheet or talks with a party involved in the sale. He opined that this property was comparable to the subject in functional obsolescence because the building was flush with parking in front of Roberts Road and some spaces were deeper than others. He opined it was not a classic strip center design.

Ryan stated he looked at the market for properties that were not classic, straight across strip centers. He testified the comparables are either inhibited by the building's lack of prominence and exposure, bad design or lack of a good anchor tenant.

Ryan testified that he relies on all forms of documentation to confirm a sale, but gives most weight to conversations with the buyer, seller or broker.

In regards to the ingress and egress of the subject, Ryan testified that several lanes of on-coming traffic must be crossed.

The board of review submitted "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal" that reflect the subject's total assessment of \$1,673,096 yielding a market value of \$4,402,884 or \$74.60 per square foot of building area, including land, using the Cook County Real Property Classification Ordinance for Class 5A property of 38%. In support of this market value, the notes included a retrospective appraisal. The appraiser, Jeffrey M. Hortsch, utilized the income and sales comparison approaches to value to estimate the value of the subject property at \$4,185,000 as of January 1, 2004. As a result of its analysis, the board requested confirmation of the subject's assessments. At the hearing, the board of review did not call any witnesses and rested its case upon its written evidence submissions.

The intervenor, Village of Franklin Park, adopted the evidence submitted by the board of review.

In support of the Leyden C.H.S.D. #212's position, this intervenor submitted a complete, summary appraisal of the subject with an effective date of January 1, 2004 and an estimated market value of \$5,000,000. The appraiser is Eric Dost. Mr. Dost was the intervenors' only witness in this appeal. Mr. Dost testified that he is president of Dost Valuation Group since 2003 and also holds the designation of MAI. Dost also stated he is a certified appraiser in five states, including Illinois. He stated he has performed over 2,500 appraisals over the course of his career with, roughly, 2,000 commercial properties and 500 of those strip shopping centers. Dost testified he has been an expert witness before the City of Chicago Zoning Board, the Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board, and the North Dakota State Board of Appeals. Dost was voir dired by the appellant's attorney. Over the objection of the appellant, Dost was admitted as an expert in the field of property valuation by PTAB.

Dost testified he performed an exterior and partial interior inspection of the subject on March 16, 2006. Dost described the subject's neighborhood characteristics. He opined that the subject property's highest and best use would be a continuation of its present use. In addition, Dost developed the three traditional approaches to value in estimating the subject's market value. The cost approach indicated a value of \$3,100,000, rounded, for the land while the income approach indicated a value of \$5,000,000, rounded. The sales comparison approach indicated a value of \$5,000,000, rounded. The appraiser concluded a market value of \$5,000,000 for the subject property as of January 1, 2004.

Dost opined that the highest and best use of the subject as vacant was commercial use and that as improved, its highest and best use would be its current use. The first method developed was the cost approach to estimate a value for the land. Dost testified he reviewed four land sales. The properties sold from November 2003 to July 2004 for prices ranging from \$2.98 to \$22.03 per square foot. Dost opined that the two most comparable sales were #1 and #3. After adjustments, Dost estimated the subject land at \$9.00 per square foot or \$3,100,000.

The next method developed was the sales comparison approach. Under this approach, Dost utilized four suggested sales comparables. These buildings are described as strip shopping centers between 10 and 33 years old. The properties ranged in size from 32,036 to 82,359 square feet of rentable area. They sold from January 2003 to July 2004 for prices ranging from \$4,000,000 to \$5,850,000 or from \$71.03 to \$138.13 per square foot of rentable area.

Dost testified he made adjustments for various factors of comparison. He testified he also considered the sale of the subject property in 2000, but deemed it not relevant for several

reasons. The first reason, he opined, was because market conditions had changed dramatically since the sale, a number of improvements were made to the subject, and two of the comparable properties had previous sales. Dost testified that comparable #4 sold previously in 2001 for 47% less than the current sale and that comparable #1 sold previously in 2000 for 38% less than the current sale. He opined these sales support the data of decreasing vacancy rates, increasing rents, and increasing prices.

Dost determined a value for the subject of \$85.00 per square foot of rentable area which yields an estimate of value under this approach of \$5,000,000, rounded.

Under the income approach, Dost testified he examined two sets of rent comparables, one for the in-line stores and one for the out lots. For the in-line stores, Dost testified he reviewed the rental data on four comparables. The asking rent for the in-line space ranged from \$12.00 to \$14.40 per square foot of rentable area on a triple net basis. After making adjustments, Dost concluded a rent for the subject at \$11.00 per square foot for the in-line space and \$8.00 a square foot for the larger anchor store space. For the out lot space, Dost testified that these buildings have prominent frontage space and opined that with greater visibility and smaller space comes higher rents. Dost reviewed the rental data on four comparable out lots that ranged in asking price from \$12.63 to \$30.00 per square foot of rentable area. After adjustments, Dost concluded a rent for the out lots at \$20.00 per square foot of rentable area. Dost testified he deducted 10% percent off the asking prices for conditions of rental because asking prices typically are set high in order to allow room for negotiation. He based this figure on a study he performed of asking rents versus contract rents.

Dost stated he estimated vacancy and collection at 6%. He testified he reviewed the subject's vacancy, vacancy rates of surrounding shopping centers located at the subject's intersection, and the *2004 Chicago Retail Market Index Brief*.

As to expenses, Dost testified he analyzed the subject's history, information from the Urban Land Institute, and typical expenses for similar properties as found in Korpacz Real Estate Investor's Survey. Total operating expenses were estimated at \$623,815 for an operating income (NOI) at \$503,293. Dost opined this figure was consistent with the historical expenses of the subject.

In determining the appropriate capitalization rate (CAP rate), Dost testified he applied three different methods. He stated he reviewed the CAP rates of the sales comparisons which ranged from 9.1% to 11% and Korpacz Real Estate Survey, first quarter, 2004, wherein rates for non-institutional retail strip shopping centers ranged from 8.5% to 12%. In addition, Dost testified that he

applied a band of investment analysis. He testified he concluded a CAP rate of 10%. NOI was then capitalized by this rate to reflect a market value estimate under the income approach of \$5,000,000, rounded, for the subject.

In reconciling the various approaches, Dost testified because the subject property is a multi tenant retail property, an income producing property, the income approach was given primary emphasis; secondary consideration was given to the sales comparison approach.

Under cross-examination, Dost testified and his appraisal notes that the subject property's southwest corner is within a flood zone. Dost was presented with Appellant's Exhibit #2; he acknowledged that he does not state the percentage of the property that is within the floodplain and indicated the map he reviewed did not have a layout of the improvements or parcels. Dost testified he did not make a specific adjustment to the comparables for floodplain, but took several factors into consideration. He opined that the exhibit did not clarify which areas were 100 year, 500 year, or zone X flood zones.

As to the land sales, Dost acknowledged that sale #1 was a corner lot and larger than the subject. He testified sale #2 was the weakest sale and he did not place emphasis on this sale. Dost was presented with Appellant's Exhibit #10, a copy of an aerial map for comparable #2 and a copy of a Schiller Park zoning map. Dost agreed the property is located on the edge of a cemetery and opined that the deed restrictions of this property were because of its location. Dost opined sale #3 was inferior to the subject because there were vacant improvements on the property that needed to be demolished.

As to the sales comparables, Dost acknowledged sale #1 was smaller than the subject and located quite a distance away, but he opined that the location was on a primary thoroughfare such as the subject, the property is an interior lot, and does have frontage on two streets. He testified he was not aware of any flood issues or circulation issues for the comparables. Dost was presented with Appellant's Exhibit #11, a copy of the transfer declaration filing for sale #3. Dost acknowledged that the words "Buy Sell" are handwritten on the form. He testified that he did not contact any parties involved in the sale to confirm the sale.

Dost was presented with Appellant's Exhibit #8 in regards to sale #4. The 2001 sale was utilized by the appellant's appraiser while Dost utilized the 2004 sale. Dost opined that the property was worth more than \$4,000,000 because the mortgage was for more than that price. He asserted that exchange situations do not mean that much and are common.

As to the income approach, Dost acknowledged that two of the rental comparables are larger than the subject and two are

smaller. He also agreed that the comparables are all asking rents from 2005 or 2006. He was questioned extensively in regards to the subject's historical expenses versus the stabilized expenses listed in the appraisal.

Dost asserted he used stabilized taxes for tax recoveries because the leases were on a triple net basis. He testified that loading the cap rate is another method for considering taxes, but would require a prorated factor for the vacancy rate.

After hearing the testimony and considering the evidence, 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. *Property Tax Appeal Board Rule 1910.63(e)*. 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. *Property Tax Appeal Board Rule 1910.65(c)*.

Having considered the evidence presented, the PTAB concludes that the appellant has not satisfied this burden and that a reduction is not warranted.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property for the 2004 tax year, the PTAB closely examined the parties' two appraisal reports. The PTAB accords little weight to the board of review's evidence for the report lacked the preparer's testimony to explain the methodology used therein.

That having been said, the PTAB then looks to the remaining evidence that comprises the Ryan appraisal and testimony submitted by the appellant and the Dost appraisal and testimony submitted by the intervenor Leyden C.H.S.D. #212.

The courts have stated that where there is credible evidence of comparable sales, these sales are to be given significant weight as evidence of market value. Chrysler Corp. v. Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board, 69 Ill.App.3d 207 (2nd Dist. 1979); Willow Hill Grain, Inc. v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 187 Ill.App.3d 9 (5th Dist. 1989). Therefore, the PTAB will give primary weight to the sales comparison approaches within the appraisals.

In totality, the parties' experts submitted nine suggested sales comparables. In Willow Hill Grain, Inc. v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 187 Ill.App.3d 9, the Court held that of the three primary methods of evaluating property for purposes of real estate taxes, the preferred method is the sales comparison approach. Thus, the PTAB finds that the best evidence of value is the market data submitted by the parties under this approach to value.

The PTAB gives little weight to appellant's sale #1, the sale of the subject property in 2000. There was significant testimony from all the witnesses that the property was not on the market at the time of sale, but that the appellant, a relation to the grocery store leasing space, approached the landlord to purchase the property. In addition, there were significant upgrades to the property done after the purchase of the property. In addition, the PTAB finds the appellant failed to submit sufficient evidence that the subject's location in a flood plain negatively affects the subject's market value. There was no evidence, including the appellant's own appraisal, which showed any damage to the subject property based on flooding.

The appellant's appraiser testified that, in regards to sale #3, there was a subsequent sale of this property in 2002, closer to the lien date, which was not in the appellant's appraisal. Ryan did not provide any testimony to indicate this sale was not at arm's length. Therefore, the PTAB will use this subsequent sale for this comparable.

The appellant's comparable #4 and the board of review's comparable #4 are the same property, but two different sale dates are used. The appellant used a prior sale in 2001 and the intervenor used the 2004 sale. The PTAB accords little weight to the 2004 sale due to the fact this property was never offered on the open market, but was part of a 1031 exchange.

The PTAB finds that Appellant's Exhibit #11 is not sufficient evidence to question the arm's length nature of the intervenor's sales comparable #3. The appellant did not provide any testimony to show a clear understanding as to what the words written on the transfer declaration filing meant in regards to the arm's length nature of the sale. Therefore, the PTAB gives weight to this sale.

The remaining sales were also given weight by the PTAB. In total, the seven properties sold between July 2001 and July 2007 had had a sales range of \$26.61 to \$138.13 per square foot of rentable area, including land. The subject property's current assessment yields a market value of \$74.60 which is within the unadjusted range of these comparables.

After considering all the evidence, including the experts' testimony and submitted documentation, as well as the adjustments and differences for characteristics in the appellant's and the intervenor's suggested comparables, the PTAB finds that the subject's current 2004 assessment is supported by the properties contained in this record.

As a result of this analysis, the PTAB finds that the evidence and testimony has demonstrated that the subject property was

Docket No: 04-21567.001-C-3 through 04-21567.003-C-3

correctly valued and that a reduction or increase in the subject's assessment 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

Frank A. Huff

Member

Mario Morris

Member

Shawn R. Lerbis

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 23, 2010

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.