



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

APPELLANT: Cari A. Murray
DOCKET NO.: 07-28742.001-I-1 through 07-28742.007-I-1
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Cari A. Murray, the appellant, by attorney Thomas J. Thorson in Oak Park, 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
07-28742.001-I-1	17-07-406-024-0000	3,749	153	\$3,902
07-28742.002-I-1	17-07-406-025-0000	3,749	5,671	\$9,420
07-28742.003-I-1	17-07-406-026-0000	3,749	6,720	\$10,469
07-28742.004-I-1	17-07-406-027-0000	12,514	18,990	\$31,504
07-28742.005-I-1	17-07-406-035-0000	3,749	4,447	\$8,196
07-28742.006-I-1	17-07-406-036-0000	3,749	4,447	\$8,196
07-28742.007-I-1	17-07-406-037-0000	24,983	31,130	\$56,113

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of a 44,640 square foot parcel of land improved with a 52-year old, one-story, masonry, 44,280 square foot industrial building with five bays that have been connected to each other. The appellant, via counsel, argued that the fair market value of the subject was not accurately reflected in its assessed value.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted an appraisal by James A. Matthews and Jennifer Soto-Burrell of James A. Matthews, Inc. The report indicates Matthews and Soto-Burrell are State of Illinois certified general appraisers. The appraisers indicated the subject has an estimated market value of \$355,000 as of January 1, 2007. The appraisal report utilized the sales comparison approach to value to estimate the market value for the subject property. The appraisal finds the subject's highest and best use is its current use.

Under the sales comparison approach, the appraiser analyzed the sales of four one to four-story industrial buildings located within the subject's market. The properties contain between 68,000 and 95,024 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from January 2004 to June 2004 for prices ranging from \$540,000 to \$1,025,000 or from \$5.99 to \$10.79 per square foot of building area, including land. 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 \$8.00 per square foot of building area, including land, or \$355,000, rounded.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's final assessment of \$199,259 was disclosed. The subject's final assessment reflects a fair market value of \$553,497 when the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance for class 5b property of 36% is applied. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review presented descriptions and assessment information on five suggested comparables located within the subject's market. The properties consist of one to five-story industrial buildings that range in size from 43,000 to 49,196 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from July 2002 to January 2008 for prices ranging from \$1,725,000 to \$6,180,000 or from \$35.06 to \$138.26 per square foot of building area, including land.

At hearing, the appellant's attorney argued that the appraisal is the best evidence of the subject's market value. He also noted that the appraisal indicates the subject is highly depreciated. The board of review's representative noted that the appraisal's comparable sales have recording dates from 2004 to 2007.

After hearing the testimony and 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. 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 (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 evidence presented, the PTAB concludes that the 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 sales comparison approach 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 comparables as the information provided was unadjusted raw sales data.

Therefore, the PTAB finds the subject had a market value of \$355,000 for the 2007 assessment year. Since the market value of this parcel has been established, the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance for class 5b property of 36% will apply. In applying this level of assessment to the subject, the total assessed value is \$127,800 while the subject's current total assessed value is above this amount. Therefore, the PTAB 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: 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.