



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

APPELLANT: Bohdan Kroczek  
DOCKET NO.: 08-22460.001-R-3 through 08-22460.002-R-3  
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Bohdan Kroczek, the appellant(s), by attorney Scott Shudnow, of Shudnow & Shudnow, 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:

DOCKET NO	PARCEL NUMBER	LAND	IMPRVMT	TOTAL
08-22460.001-R-3	05-17-203-028-0000	71,582	25,528	\$ 97,110
08-22460.002-R-3	05-17-203-029-0000	165,308	6,382	\$ 171,690

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject has 68,666 square feet of land, which is improved with a 39 year old, two-story, frame and masonry, single-family dwelling. The subject's improvement size is 6,784 square feet of living area, and its total assessment is \$656,777. This assessment yields a fair market value of \$6,841,427, or \$1,008.47 per square foot of living area (including land), after applying the 2008 Illinois Department of Revenue three year median level of assessment for Class 2 properties of 9.60%. The appellant, via counsel, argued that the fair market value of the subject property was not accurately reflected in its assessed value as the basis of this appeal.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted a residential appraisal report for the subject property with an effective date of January 1, 2008. The appraiser estimated a fair market value for the subject of \$2,800,000 based on the cost and sales comparison approaches to value. The appraiser also conducted an inspection of the subject.

Under the sales comparison approach, the appraiser analyzed five recent sales in the subject's market. The net adjustments made to these five comparables ranged from 3.6% to 50.2%, with three of the comparables having net adjustments exceeding the suggested

guideline of 15.0% found in the U.S. Housing and Urban Development Handbook. U.S. Housing and Urban Development Handbook 4150.2, Appendix D, D-31 (the "HUD Handbook"). The gross adjustments made to these five comparables ranged from 28.5% to 56.0%, with all five of the comparables having gross adjustments exceeding the suggested guideline of 25.0% found in the HUD Handbook. Each of the five comparables also has at least two line item adjustments in excess of the suggested guideline of 10.0% found in the HUD Handbook. 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 total assessment of \$656,777 was disclosed. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted descriptive and assessment information for four properties suggested as comparable to the subject. The comparables are described as two-story, masonry or frame and masonry, single-family dwellings. Additionally, the comparables range: in age from 8 to 105 years; in size from 6,110 to 6,968 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$54.13 to \$67.27 per square foot of living area. The comparables also have several amenities. The board of review's grid sheet also states that Comparable #2 sold in November 2005 for \$7,475,000, or \$1,072.76 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

In rebuttal, the appellant argued that the board of review's lone sales comparable should be given no weight because it is too remote in time to accurately depict the subject's market value as of January 1, 2008. The appellant also reaffirmed the evidence previously submitted.

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 appraiser utilized the cost and sales comparison approaches 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 property, reviewed the property's history, and used similar properties in the sales comparison approach while providing adjustments that were necessary. Moreover, the guidelines in the HUD Handbook state that any net adjustment over 15.0%, any gross adjustment over 25.0%, or any line item adjustment over 10.0% should be explained by the appraiser. The appraiser did explain these adjustments on page three of the appraisal. There, it was stated that the subject's land size is atypically large for the area, and that a search of the subject's market area did not yield any sales with similar ages, living area, and modernization. Therefore, the Board finds that, even though significant adjustments were made outside the guidelines found in the HUD Handbook, the appraiser adequately explained why the adjustments were necessary. Also, the Board gives little weight to the board of review's evidence as it was raw sales data that did not make any adjustments for age, exterior construction, improvement size, improvement type, location, or market conditions.

Therefore, the Board finds the subject had a market value of \$2,800,000 for the 2008 assessment year. Since the market value of this parcel has been established, the 2008 Illinois Department of Revenue three year median level of assessment for Class 2 property of 9.60% 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 \$268,800, 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.

*Ronald 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: December 20, 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.