



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

APPELLANT: Andy Pipitone
DOCKET NO.: 07-27017.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 09-11-201-028-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Andy Pipitone, the appellant(s), by attorney Stephanie Park, of Park & Longstreet, P.C. in Rolling Meadows; 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: \$9,303
IMPR.: \$58,467
TOTAL: \$67,770

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of a parcel of land improved with a seven-year old, two-story, frame and masonry, single-family dwelling containing two and one-half baths, air conditioning, a fireplace, and a full, unfinished basement. The appellant argued that the fair market value of the subject was not accurately reflected in its assessed value and that the subject was inequitably assessed as the bases of the appeal.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted an appraisal undertaken by Dave Schmidt with JSG Real Estate services, Inc. The report indicates Greenfield is a State of Illinois licensed residential appraiser. The appraiser indicated an estimated market value of \$675,000 as of May 25, 2007. The appraisal report utilized the cost and sales comparison approaches to value to estimate the market value for the subject property.

In summarizing the subject property, the appraisal describes the subject as a two-story, frame and masonry dwelling containing

3,097 square feet of living area. The appraisal indicates the property was personally inspected. The appraisal found the subject's highest and best use to be its present use.

In the cost approach to value, the appraiser utilized the allocation method to estimate the subject's land value at \$300,000. The replacement cost new was utilized to arrive at a cost new value for the improvement of \$416,015. Using the age/life method of depreciation, the subject improvement was depreciated by \$34,654 for a depreciated improvement value of \$381,361. Site improvements and land value were added back in to arrive at a value under the cost approach of \$686,361.

Under the sales comparison approach, the appraiser analyzed the sales of three properties described as two-story, frame or frame and masonry, single-family dwellings located within the subject's market. The properties contain between 2,541 and 3,149 square feet of living area and sold from July 2006 to March 2007 for prices ranging from \$579,000 to \$700,000 or from \$187.36 to \$228.31 per square foot of living area. The appraiser adjusted each of the comparables for pertinent factors. 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 \$675,000.

In reconciling the approaches, the appraiser gave most weight to the sales comparison approach to determine a final estimate of value for the subject as of May 25, 2007 of \$675,000.

In support of the equity argument, the appellant submitted information on a total of four properties suggested as comparable. The board of review lists the subject as containing 3,480 square feet of building area. The suggested comparables are described as two-story, frame and masonry, single-family dwellings. Features include two and one-half or three and one-half baths, air conditioning, a fireplace, and a partial or full unfinished basement. The properties range: in age from 20 to 41 years; in size from 3,262 to 3,557 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$17.42 to \$17.58 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's improvement assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's final assessment of \$72,603 was disclosed. The subject's final assessment reflects a fair market value of \$723,137 when the Illinois Department of Revenue's 2007 three-year median level of assessment of 10.04% for Cook County Class 2 properties is applied.

In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review presented descriptions and assessment information on three properties suggested as comparable. The properties are described as two-story, masonry and frame, single-family dwellings. Features include between two and one-half and three and one-half baths, air conditioning, a fireplace, and full unfinished

basements. The properties range: in age from two to seven years old; in size from 3,090 to 3,473 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$19.01 to \$24.67 per square foot of living area. One property sold in February 2005 for \$350,000 or from \$113.27 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 argued that the appellant's evidence shows the subject is overvalued and over assessed. The appellant then submitted *Appellant's Hearing Exhibit 1*, a printout of a map showing the proximity of all the suggested comparables to the subject property.

After reviewing the record 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. 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 market value evidence presented, the PTAB concludes that this 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 cost and sales comparison 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; and 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 evidence as the documentation is merely assessment information or unadjusted sales data.

Therefore, the PTAB finds the subject had a market value of \$675,000 for the 2007 assessment year. Since the market value of this parcel has been established, the Illinois Department of Revenue's 2007 three-year median level of assessment of 10.04% for Cook County Class 2 properties will apply. In applying this level of assessment to the subject, the total assessed value is \$67,770 while the subject's current total assessed value is above this amount. Therefore, the PTAB finds that a reduction is warranted. Once this reduction is applied, the PTAB finds the subject is equitably assessed.

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.