



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

APPELLANT: Verizon Communications  
DOCKET NO.: 08-28761.001-C-1 through 08-28761.009-C-1  
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Verizon Communications, the appellant(s), by attorney Dennis M. Nolan, of Dennis M. Nolan, P.C. in Bartlett; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds **\*\*no change an increase 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:

<b>DOCKET NO</b>	<b>PARCEL NUMBER</b>	<b>LAND</b>	<b>IMPRVMT</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
08-28761.001-C-1	25-33-403-001-0000	2,213		\$2,213
08-28761.002-C-1	25-33-403-002-0000	33,412		\$33,412
08-28761.003-C-1	25-33-404-001-0000	3,570	817	\$4,387
08-28761.004-C-1	25-33-404-002-0000	4,405		\$4,405
08-28761.005-C-1	25-33-404-003-0000	4,405		\$4,405
08-28761.006-C-1	25-33-404-004-0000	4,405		\$4,405
08-28761.007-C-1	25-33-404-005-0000	5,221	1,215	\$6,436
08-28761.008-C-1	25-33-404-031-0000	50,374	423,861	\$474,235
08-28761.009-C-1	25-33-407-024-0000	47,878	284,827	\$332,708

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property consists of nine parcels of land totaling 134,450 square feet and improved with a nine-year old, one-story, masonry, bowling alley. The appellant argued that the 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 summary appraisal report of the subject property with an effective date of January 1, 2008. The appraiser estimated a market value for the subject of \$1,130,000 based upon the three

traditional approaches to value. The appraisal indicated the subject was inspected and listed the improvement size as 53,920 square feet of building area.

In addition, the appellant requests a further reduction in the subject's assessment based on the subject's vacancy. In support of this argument, the appellant indicated the subject was 37% vacant in 2008. Based upon this evidence, the appellant requests 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 \$892,427. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$2,443,573 using the Cook County Ordinance level of assessment of 36% for class 5b, industrial property; 22% for class 1, vacant property; and 38% for class 5a, commercial property.

In addition, the board of review submitted detailed descriptive and sales data on seven properties suggested as comparable. These properties sold for prices ranging from \$530,000 to \$4,900,000 or from \$10.96 to \$94.41 per square foot of building area. Based upon this evidence, the board requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

After considering the arguments and reviewing 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 (3<sup>rd</sup> Dist. 2002); Winnebago County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 313 Ill.App.3d 179 (2<sup>nd</sup> 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 Board concludes that the appellant has met this burden and that a reduction is warranted.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board thoroughly considered the parties' evidence and finds the best evidence to be the appellant's appraisal. The Board finds this appraisal to be persuasive for the appraiser inspected the subject property and developed the sales comparison approach to value in estimating the subject's market value. Moreover, market data was used to obtain improved sale comparables while providing sufficient detail regarding each sale as well as appropriate adjustments, where necessary.

The appellant requested a further reduction and submitted documentation showing the vacancy of the subject property. The PTAB 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.

The appellant submitted an appraisal which estimated the subject's market value based on income and vacancy factors from the market.

Therefore, the Board finds that a reduction to the appellant's requested amount 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.