



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

APPELLANT: Assefa Judah  
DOCKET NO.: 06-29135.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 16-13-234-013-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Assefa Judah, the appellant(s), by attorney Lisa A. Marino, of Marino & Assoc., PC in Chicago; 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:** \$9,197  
**IMPR.:** \$1,313  
**TOTAL:** \$10,510

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property consists of a 4,599 square foot parcel of land improved with a 120-year old, two-story, masonry, mixed-use building containing 2,586 square feet of living area, four baths and a full, unfinished basement. The appellant argued both unequal treatment in the assessment process that the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in the property's assessed valuation as the bases of this appeal.

In support of the equity argument, the appellant, via counsel, submitted information on a total of three properties suggested as comparable and located within eight blocks of the subject. The properties are described as two or three-story, masonry, mixed-use buildings with four to six baths and a partial, unfinished basement. The properties range: in age from 92 to 114 years; in size from 5,715 to 6,473 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$3.60 to \$4.25 per square foot of living area.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted a brief arguing that the subject property was awaiting rehabilitation and was therefore 90% vacant for the 2006 tax year. The appellant further argued that a 10% occupancy factor should be applied to the improvement's assessed value to account for the vacancy. The appellant also submitted copies of an occupancy affidavit for 2006 and a general affidavit from the owner both indicating the property was vacant during 2006.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's improvement assessment of \$13,135 or \$5.11 per square foot of living area was disclosed. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review presented descriptions and assessment information on a total of four properties suggested as comparable and located within five blocks of the subject. The properties are described as two-story, masonry, mixed-use buildings with two to six baths and a partial, unfinished basement. The properties range: in age from 98 to 110 years; in size from 2,772 to 2,970 square feet of living area and in improvement assessment from \$5.32 to \$6.11 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

At hearing, the appellant's attorney asserted that the owner purchased the property in 2004 and began the process of rehabbing the building and therefore, left the property vacant for 2006. She further asserted that the subject property was given a 10% occupancy factor for 2007 and 2008 tax years, but did not have any documentation to support this.

The board of review's representative indicated that the board's evidence shows that the subject property has a 10% occupancy factor applied in 2007.

After reviewing the record and considering the testimony, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal. The Board further finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

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 evidence presented, the PTAB concludes that the evidence indicates a reduction is warranted.

The PTAB finds the subject property was vacant during the 2006 tax year while the subject property underwent rehab construction. The appellant's evidence which is supported by the testimony and

evidence of the board of review indicates the property received a 10% vacancy factor in 2007 for while the rehab construction continued. Therefore, the PTAB finds that based upon the county assessor's 2007 improvement assessment reduction, it is appropriate to reduce the appellant's 2006 improvement assessment to \$1,313. Thereby, the PTAB finds that a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The appellant contends unequal treatment in the subject's improvement assessment as the basis of the appeal. Taxpayers who object to an assessment on the basis of lack of uniformity bear the burden of proving the disparity of assessment valuations by clear and convincing evidence. Kankakee County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 131 Ill.2d 1 (1989). After an analysis of the assessment data, the Board finds the appellant has not met this burden.

The parties submitted a total of eight properties suggested as comparable to the subject. The PTAB finds the appellant's comparables #2, and #4 and the board of review's comparables #1, #3, and #4 the most similar to the subject in design, construction, size, and age. Due to their similarities to the subject, these comparables received the most weight in the PTAB's analysis. The properties are masonry, two-story, mixed-use dwellings located within eight blocks of the subject. The properties range: in age from 76 to 103 years; in size from 2,555 to 5,800 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessment from \$5.20 to \$15.24 per square foot of living area. In comparison, the subject's improvement assessment of \$10.59 per square foot of living area is within the range of these comparables. The remaining comparables were given less weight due to disparities in size and/or construction. After considering adjustments and the differences in both parties' comparables when compared to the subject, the Board finds the subject's per square foot improvement assessment is supported and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

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 evidence presented, the PTAB concludes that the evidence indicates a reduction is not warranted.

The appellant submitted documentation showing the income of the subject property. The PTAB gives the appellant's argument little

weight. 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" 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 that 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. Id. at 431.

Actual expenses and income based on vacancy can be useful when shown that they are reflective of the market. Although the appellant's attorney made this argument, the appellant did not demonstrate through an expert in real estate valuation that the subject's actual income and expenses are reflective of the market. To demonstrate or estimate the subject's market value using income, 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 reflective of the market and the property's capacity for earning income. The appellant did not provide such evidence and, therefore, the PTAB gives this argument no weight and finds that 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

*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: December 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.