



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

APPELLANT: Piper Real Estate, Inc.
DOCKET NO.: 07-28321.001-R-1 through 07-28321.002-R-1
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Piper Real Estate, Inc., the appellant, by attorney Terrence Kennedy Jr., of Law Offices of Terrence Kennedy Jr. 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:

DOCKET NO	PARCEL NUMBER	LAND	IMPRVMT	TOTAL
07-28321.001-R-1	03-24-200-023-0000	16,748	0	\$16,748
07-28321.002-R-1	03-24-200-029-0000	9,800	25,825	\$35,625

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of two parcels of land containing 12,654 square feet, improved with a 35-year old, three-story, masonry, multi-family dwelling containing six units. The improvement contains 5,796 square feet of living area with six full baths and nine bedrooms.

The appellant raised two arguments: first, that there is unequal treatment in the assessment process; and second, that the subject's market value is not accurately reflected in its assessment as the bases of this appeal.

In support of the equity argument, the appellant submitted descriptive and assessment data for five suggested comparables located on the same block as the subject. The properties are improved with a 5,796 square foot, three-story, masonry, multi-family dwelling with six units and six full baths. They are either 35 or 36 years old and range in improvement assessment from \$4.43 to \$4.99 per square foot of living area. The

subject's improvement assessment is \$7.57 per square foot of living area.

As to the overvaluation argument, the appellant submitted assessment and sales data for four additional suggested comparables. The appellant also included copies of the recorded deed for each suggested sale comparable. The properties are located within the same development as the subject and are improved with a six-unit, multi-family dwelling. These properties sold from May 2006 to July 2007 for prices that ranged from \$446,000 to \$470,000, or from \$77.64 to \$90.10 per square foot of living area, including land. Based upon this analysis, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The board of review submitted "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's total assessment was \$70,421. This assessment reflects a total market value of \$701,404 or \$121.02 per square foot based upon the application of the Illinois Department of Revenue's three-year median level of assessment for tax year 2007 of 10.04% for class 2 property.

The board of review submitted descriptive and assessment data as well as photographs relating to four suggested comparables. They are all located on the same block as the subject. The properties are improved with a 5,796 square foot, 35 year old, three-story, masonry, multi-family dwelling with six bathrooms and nine bedrooms. They range in improvement assessment from \$6.33 to \$7.57 per square foot. The board of review also indicated on its grid sheet that comparable #3 and comparable #4 sold in August 2004 and November 2004 for \$372,714 and \$402,592, or \$64.31 and \$69.46 per square foot of living area, including land. As a result of its analysis, the board requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

After considering the arguments as well as reviewing the evidence, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal.

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 data, the Board finds that the appellant has not met this burden.

The Board finds that comparables #1 through #5 submitted by the appellant as well as comparables #1 through #4 submitted by the board of review are most similar to the subject in location, improvement size, age and/or amenities. In analysis, the Board accorded most weight to these comparables. These comparables range in improvement assessment from \$4.43 to \$7.57 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment at

\$7.57 per square foot is within the range established by these comparables. Therefore, the Board finds no reduction is warranted as to this issue raised by the appellant.

As to the appellant's second issue, when market value is the basis of the appeal, the value of the property must be proved 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.Adm.Code 1910.65(c)). Having considered the evidence presented, the Board finds that the appellant has met this burden and that a reduction is warranted.

The Board finds the sale comparables submitted by the appellant to be most persuasive. These comparables were similar to the subject in location, style, improvement size and amenities. In addition, the sale date was in close proximation to the lien date. In analysis, the Board accorded most weight to these comparables. These comparables ranged in price from \$77.64 to \$90.10 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's purported market value designated by the assessor's office at \$121.02 per square foot is above the range established by these sale comparables.

Therefore, the Board finds that the appellant has met its burden by a preponderance of the evidence and that the subject does warrant a reduction based upon the market data submitted into evidence.

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: June 22, 2012



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.