



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

APPELLANT: Brad Sherman  
DOCKET NO.: 08-27954.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 06-35-306-085-1002

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Brad Sherman, the appellant, by attorney Timothy J. Hammersmith, of Masuda, Funai, Eifert & Mitchell, Ltd. in Chicago; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds no change 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:** \$ 1,892  
**IMPR.:** \$ 14,631  
**TOTAL:** \$ 16,523

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property consists of a residential condominium that is a rental property.

The appellant argued that the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in the property's assessed valuation as the bases of the appeal.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted a residential lease, a security deposit agreement, an affidavit from the appellant indicating that the subject was damaged by flooding on September 14, 2008, a spreadsheet outlining expenses incurred for property repairs, an income analysis, and a copy of the appellant's IRS Forms 1040 Schedule E regarding the 2006

through 2008 tax years. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's improvement assessment.

The board of review submitted "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's total assessment was \$16,523 for the tax year 2008. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$82,615 using the Cook County Ordinance Level of Assessment for Class 3, rental property of 20%.

In support of the subject's market value, the board of review submitted a memorandum from Analyst Matt Panush, stating that this appeal concerns four residential condominium units that are owned by the same person. Further, Mr. Panush requested that the Board not consider the appellant's income and expense argument to establish fair market value for this classification of property. As a result of its analysis, the board requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

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.

The appellant submitted documentation showing the income and loss of the subject property. The Board gives the appellant's argument little weight. In Springfield Marine Bank v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 44 Ill.2d 428 (1970), the court stated:

[I]t is the value of the "tract or lot of real property" which is assessed, rather than the value of the interest presently held. . . [R]ental income may of course be a relevant factor. However, it cannot be the controlling factor, particularly where it is admittedly misleading as to the fair cash value of the property involved. . . [E]arning capacity is properly regarded as the most significant element in arriving at "fair cash value".

Many factors may prevent a property owner from realizing an income from property that accurately reflects its true earning capacity; but it is the capacity for earning income, rather than the income actually derived, which reflects "fair cash value" for taxation purposes. Id. at 431.

Actual expenses and income can be useful when shown that they are reflective of the market. Although the appellant's attorney made this argument, the appellant did not demonstrate through an

expert in real estate valuation that the subject's actual income and expenses are reflective of the market. To demonstrate or estimate the subject's market value using income, one must establish, through the use of market data, the market rent, vacancy and collection losses, and expenses to arrive at a net operating income reflective of the market and the property's capacity for earning income. The appellant did not provide credible and sufficient evidence and, therefore, the Board gives this argument no weight and finds that a reduction based on market value is not 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: February 21, 2014



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.