



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

APPELLANT: DCT Lunt Avenue, LLC  
DOCKET NO.: 07-23361.001-I-1  
PARCEL NO.: 08-35-202-050-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are DCT Lunt Avenue, LLC, the appellant(s), by attorney Terrence J. Griffin, of Eugene L. Griffin & Associates, Ltd. 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:** \$ 74,551  
**IMPR.:** \$ 293,449  
**TOTAL:** \$ 368,000

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property consists of 108,176 square feet of land that is improved with a 37 year old, masonry, industrial warehouse building with 63,713 square feet of building area, of which 6,260 square feet is used as office space. The subject has a sprinkler system, seven interior truck docks, one drive-in door, 17-foot ceilings, and a land-to-building ratio of 1.70:1. The appellant, via counsel, argued that the subject's market value was not accurately reflected in its assessment.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted an appraisal undertaken by Jason D. Zaley of Maresh, Zaley & Associates, Inc. The report states that Mr. Zaley is a licensed State of Illinois Certified General Real Estate Appraiser and holds the designation of MAI. The appraiser stated that the subject had an estimated market value of \$2,300,000 as of January 1, 2007. 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 states that Mr. Zaley personally inspected the subject, and that the subject's highest and best use as improved is its current use.

Under the cost approach to value, the appraiser estimated the subject's land value to be \$703,000 based on an analysis of four recent land sales near the subject. The improvement's reproduction cost was estimated to be \$3,085,454 using the Marshall and Swift Cost Manual. The appraiser added 5% for entrepreneurial incentive to arrive at a total reproduction cost new for the subject of \$3,239,727. The appraiser then deducted 55.00% from the reproduction cost new to account for depreciation of the improvement. The appraiser then added the estimated land value and the value of the depreciated reproduction cost to arrive at a value under the cost approach to value of \$2,220,000, rounded.

Under the income approach to value, the appraiser analyzed the rents of five suggested comparable nearby buildings to estimate a potential gross income of \$264,409, or \$4.15 per square foot of building area. Expenses were estimated to be \$31,012, and vacancy and collection losses were estimated to be 10.00%, for a net operating income of \$206,956. A capitalization rate of 9.00% was utilized to estimate a value under the income approach of \$2,300,000, rounded.

Under the sales comparison approach, the appraiser analyzed the sales of five suggested comparables, which are described as one-story, masonry, industrial buildings that range in actual age from 27 to 42 years old, and in size from 60,000 to 90,462 square feet of building area. Four of the sales comparables have either one or two drive-in doors, and all of the comparables have from two or seven docks. The comparables' ceiling heights range from 16 to 21 feet high and land to building ratios that range from 1.44:1 to 2.75:1. These sales comparables sold from August 2004 to September 2006 for prices ranging from \$1,960,000 to \$3,500,000, or from \$31.07 to \$38.69 per square foot of building area, including land. Comparable #4 was sold under distressed conditions, while Comparable #5 was sold as part of a sale leaseback agreement. The appraiser adjusted each of the comparables for pertinent factors, including the conditions of the sales in Comparable #4 and #5. Based on the similarities and differences of the comparables when compared to the subject, the appraiser estimated a value for the subject under the sales comparison approach of \$36.00 per square foot, including land, or \$2,295,000, rounded.

The appraiser gave the income approach primary consideration, and the sales comparison approach secondary consideration in valuing the subject. Thus, the appraiser concluded that the subject's appraised value was \$2,300,000 as of January 1, 2007. 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 \$401,901 was disclosed. The subject's final assessment yields a fair market value of \$2,511,881 when the 16% assessment level for class 6-51 property under the Cook County Classification of Real

Property Ordinance is applied. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted a property characteristic printout for the subject, and raw sales data for six industrial warehouse properties located within two and one-half miles of the subject. The sales data was collected from the CoStar Comps service, and the CoStar Comps sheets state that the research was licensed to the assessor's office. However, the board of review included a memorandum which states that the submission of these comparables is not intended to be an appraisal or an estimate of value, and should not be construed as such. The memorandum further stated that the information provided was collected from various sources, and was assumed to be factual, accurate, and reliable; but that the information had not been verified, and that the board of review did not warrant its accuracy.

The suggested comparables contained buildings that range in age from 23 to 36 years old, and in size from 45,600 to 59,371 square feet of building area. However, the age for Comparable #6 was not disclosed. All of the suggested comparables have from 2 to 21 loading docks, and from one to three overhead doors. The comparables have land-to-building ratios ranging from 1.55:1 to 3.62:1. The properties sold from October 2004 to April 2008 in an unadjusted range from \$1,687,000 to \$5,950,000, or from \$32.27 to \$101.00 per square foot of building area, land included. The printouts also indicate that the parties in Comparables #1 used the same realtor. Additionally, the buyers in Comparables #1 and #4 were real estate investment trusts. Comparables #1, #2, #3, #4, and #6 were also 100% leased at the time of the sale, while Comparable #5 was partially leased at the time of the sale. Moreover, Comparable #4 was a sale leaseback agreement. 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 a reduction is warranted.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board finds the best evidence to be the appraisal submitted by the appellant. The appraiser 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 appraiser has experience in appraising, personally inspected the subject, used similar properties in the sales comparison approach while providing adjustments that were necessary, and presented a properly developed income analysis. The Board gives little weight to the board of review's comparables as the information provided was unadjusted raw sales data, and was admittedly not intended to be an estimate of value.

Therefore, the Board finds the subject had a market value of \$2,300,000 for tax year 2007. Since market value has been determined, the Cook County Real Property Classification Ordinance as in effect for tax year 2007 shall apply. The subject is classified as a class 6-51 property. Therefore, the applicable assessment is 16% of the subject's fair market value, which equates to \$368,000. The subject's current total assessed value is higher than this value, and, therefore, the Board finds 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.

*Donald R. Cuit*

Chairman

*K. L. Fern*

Member

*Frank A. Huff*

Member

*Mario Morris*

Member

*J. R.*

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: February 22, 2013

*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.