



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

APPELLANT: Basic Capital
DOCKET NO.: 06-23593.001-C-1
PARCEL NO.: 14-21-111-006-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Basic Capital, the appellant(s), by attorney Dennis M. Nolan, of Dennis M. Nolan, P.C. in Bartlett; and the Cook 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 Cook County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$82,080
IMPR: \$715,920
TOTAL: \$798,000

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of an 8,640 square foot parcel of land improved with an 82-year old, four-story, masonry, 52-unit, hotel building containing 20,868 square feet of building area. The appellant, via counsel, argued that the fair market value of the subject was not accurately reflected in its assessed value.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted an appraisal authored by Susan Z. Ulman of Zimmerman Real Estate Group, Ltd. The report indicates Ulman is a State of Illinois certified general appraiser and hold the designation MAI. The appraiser indicated the subject has an estimated market value of \$2,100,000 as of January 1, 2006. The appraisal report utilized the three traditional approaches to value to estimate the market value for the subject property. The appraisal finds the subject's highest and best use is its continued use.

Under the cost approach to value, the appraiser accepted the market value estimate of the land as established by the Cook County Assessor's Office at \$25.00 per square foot or \$215,000,

rounded. The replacement cost new was utilized to determine a cost for the improvement at \$2,608,992. Site improvements at \$30,000 and an entrepreneurial profit of 12% were added for a total cost of \$2,955,671. The appraiser depreciated the improvement by 35% for a value of \$1,921,186. The land and miscellaneous improvements were added back in to establish a value under the cost approach of \$2,135,000, rounded.

In the income approach to value, the appraiser looked at the subject's operating statements and analyzed industry averages. The appraiser analyzed the daily room rates and industry average expenses to arrive at a net operating income of \$380,972. The band of investment method was utilized to establish a capitalization rate of 12% which was then loaded for an estimate of value under the income approach of \$2,100,000, rounded.

Under the sales comparison approach, the appraiser analyzed five types of hotel/motel buildings. The properties range: in age from seven to 76 years; in size from 14,000 to 72,000 (one property's size was unknown) square feet of building area; and in room count from 47 to 162 rooms. The comparables sold from February 2002 to May 2005 for prices ranging from \$600,000 to \$7,194,000, or from \$32.61 to \$99.92 per square foot of building area, including land with one property's price per square foot unknown or \$12,765 to \$44,407 per room. The appraiser adjusted each of the comparables for pertinent factors. Based on the similarities and difference of the comparables when compared to the subject, the appraiser estimated a value for the subject under the sales comparison approach of \$40,000 per room or \$2,080,000, rounded.

In reconciling the three approaches to value, the appraisal gave less weight to the cost approach, significant weight to the sales comparison approach and greatest weight to the income approach to arrive at a final estimate of value for the subject as of January 1, 2006 of \$2,100,000.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's final assessment of \$855,285 was disclosed. The subject's final assessment reflects a fair market value of \$2,250,750 when the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance level of assessments of 38% for Class 5A properties is applied. The board also submitted raw sales information on five properties suggested as comparable. The properties sold from November 1998 to March 2008 for prices ranging from \$1,800,000 to \$18,360,000 or from \$84.91 to \$403.52 per square foot of building area, including land. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of 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 (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 evidence presented, the PTAB concludes that the evidence indicates a reduction is warranted.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the PTAB finds the best evidence to be the appellant's appraisal. The appellant's appraiser utilized the three traditional approaches to value in determining the subject's market value. The PTAB finds this appraisal to be persuasive for the appraiser: has experience in appraising; personally inspected the subject property and reviewed the property's history; estimated a highest and best use for the subject property; utilized appropriate market data in undertaking the approaches to value; and lastly, used similar properties in the sales comparison approach while providing sufficient detail regarding each sale as well as adjustments that were necessary. The PTAB gives little weight to the board of review's comparables as the information provided was raw sales data with no adjustments made.

Therefore, the PTAB finds that the subject property had a market value of \$2,100,000 for the 2006 assessment year. Since the market value of the subject has been established, the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance level of assessment of 38% for Class 5A will apply. In applying this level of assessment to the subject, the total assessed value is \$798,000 while the subject's current total assessed value is above this amount. Therefore, the PTAB finds that a reduction 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.

Ronald R. Cuit

Chairman

K. L. Fern

Member

Frank A. Huff

Member

Mario M. Louie

Member

Shawn R. Lerski

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: June 24, 2011

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.