FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION
ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Our Gang Partners
DOCKET NO.: 07-21540.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 10-12-417-007-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Our Gang Partners, the appellant(s), by attorney George Michael Keane, Jr., of Keane and Keane 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:	$ 18,835
IMPR.:	$ 37,389
TOTAL:	$ 56,224

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property has 8,720 square feet of land, which is improved with an 87 year old, two-story, masonry, multi-family dwelling containing 2,288 square feet of living area. The subject includes two baths, a three-car garage, two fireplaces, and a full unfinished basement. The subject is located in Evanston Township, Cook County. The appellant argued that the market value of the subject property was not accurately reflected in its assessed value.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant, via counsel, submitted an appraisal undertaken by Anthony Bennett and Michael J. Sullivan of Realty Valuation Services, Inc. The appraisal report states that Bennett and Sullivan are both licensed as State of Illinois certified residential real estate appraisers. The appraisers stated that the subject had an estimated market value of $560,000 as of December 31, 2006. The appraisal report utilized the cost approach to value, the income approach to value, and the sales comparison approach to value to estimate the market value for the subject property. The appraisal report states that Bennett personally inspected the subject property, and that the subject's highest and best use as improved is its present use.

Under the cost approach to value, the appraisers used nearby land sales to estimate the subject's land value to be $325,000. The improvement's replacement cost new was estimated to be $306,000 using the Marshall and Swift cost manual. The appraisers then deducted 29.00% from the replacement cost new to account for depreciation of the improvement. The appraisers also found that the subject contains $20,000 worth of "as-is" site improvements. The appraisers then added the estimated land value, the "as-is" site improvements, and the value of the depreciated replacement cost to arrive at a value under the cost approach to value of $562,260.

Under the income approach to value, the appraisers analyzed the rents of three suggested comparable nearby properties to estimate a potential gross income of $2,475 for the subject. A gross rent multiplier of 225.00 was utilized to estimate a value under the income approach to value of $556,875.

Under the sales comparison approach, the appraisers analyzed the sales of three suggested comparables, which are described as two-story, frame or masonry, multi-family dwellings that are from 83 to 114 years old, and contain from 1,540 to 2,652 square feet of living area. Additionally, the suggested comparables have from two to three baths, two of the properties have a two-car garage, and all of the properties have a full unfinished basement. These suggested comparables sold from April 2006 to August 2006 for between $446,000 and $573,000, or from $214.93 to $289.61 per square foot of living area, including land. The appraisers adjusted each of the comparables for pertinent factors. Based on the similarities and differences of the comparables when compared to the subject, the appraisers estimated a value for the subject under the sales comparison approach to value of $560,000.

The appraisers gave the most weight to the sales comparison approach to value. Thus, the appraisers concluded that the subject's appraised value was $560,000 as of December 31, 2006. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The Cook County Board of Review submitted its "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's final assessment of $71,492 was disclosed. The subject's final assessment yields a fair market value of $712,072 when the 2007 Illinois Department of Revenue three-year median level of assessment for Class 2 properties of 10.04% is applied. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review presented descriptive and assessment information on four properties suggested as comparable to the subject. These properties are described as two-story, masonry or stucco, multi-family dwellings that are from 87 to 114 years old, and contain from 2,156 to 2,499 square feet of living area. Additionally, the suggested comparables have from two to three and one-half baths, three of the properties have from one to two fireplaces, all of the properties have a two-car garage, and a full unfinished basement. These suggested comparables have

improvement assessments ranging from $23.64 to $24.56 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment is $23.01 per square foot of living area.

The board of review's grid sheet also states that Comparable #1 sold in April 2004 for $470,000, or $205.42 per square foot of living area, including land. Furthermore, the board of review submitted a list of sales of properties located within the subject's neighborhood. This list included the property identification number, deed number, the date of the sale, and the sale price for 20 properties. No further information was provided regarding these properties. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

After reviewing the record and considering the evidence, the Property Tax Appeal Board (the "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. Cook Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 339 Ill. App. 3d 529, 545 (1st Dist. 2002); National City Bank of Michigan/Illinois v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 331 Ill. App. 3d 1038, 1042 (3d Dist. 2002) (citing Winnebago Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 313 Ill. App. 3d 179 (2d Dist. 2000)); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 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. Calumet Transfer, LLC v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 401 Ill. App. 3d 652, 655 (1st Dist. 2010); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.65(c). Having considered the evidence presented, the Board finds that the evidence indicates a reduction is warranted.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board finds the best evidence to be the appellant's appraisal. The appellant's appraisers utilized the cost approach to value, the income approach to value, and the sales comparison approach to value in determining the subject's market value. The Board finds this appraisal persuasive because the appraisers have experience in appraising, personally inspected the subject property, reviewed the property's history, and used similar properties in the sales comparison approach while providing adjustments that were necessary. The Board gives little weight to the board of review's evidence as the information provided was raw sales data.

Therefore, the Board finds the subject had a market value of $560,000 for the 2007 assessment year. Since the market value of this parcel has been established, the 2007 Illinois Department of Revenue three-year median level of assessment for Class 2 property of 10.04% will apply. 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.50(c)(2)(A). In applying this level of assessment to the

subject, the total assessed value is $56,224, while the subject's current total assessed value is above this amount. Therefore, the Board 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.

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: January 31, 2013

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.