



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

APPELLANT: Flossmoor Family Automotive
DOCKET NO.: 08-29873.001-C-1 through 08-29873.006-C-1
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Flossmoor Family Automotive, the appellant(s), by attorney Arnold G. Siegel, of Siegel & Callahan, P.C. 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
08-29873.001-C-1	31-01-418-019-0000	8,015	182	\$ 8,197
08-29873.002-C-1	31-01-418-020-0000	8,015	182	\$ 8,197
08-29873.003-C-1	31-01-418-021-0000	8,015	182	\$ 8,197
08-29873.004-C-1	31-01-418-022-0000	8,015	182	\$ 8,197
08-29873.005-C-1	31-01-418-032-0000	32,062	5,650	\$37,712
08-29873.006-C-1	31-01-418-034-0000	5,500	0	\$ 5,500

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of 31,250 square feet of land that is improved with a 56 year old, multi-level, masonry, commercial building with 4,023 square feet of building area. The subject is being used as an auto repair facility, and contains a minimally finished office space, a waiting area, two bathrooms, five overhead drive-in doors, and a parking lot. The appellant, via counsel, argued that the subject's market value was not accurately reflected in its assessment.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted an appraisal undertaken by Robert A. Flood and George K. Stamos of Meridian Appraisal & Consulting Group, Ltd. The report states that Mr. Flood and Mr. Stamos are both licensed as State of Illinois Certified General Real Estate Appraisers. The appraisers stated that the subject had an estimated market value of \$200,000 as of January 1, 2008. The appraisal report utilized the sales comparison approach to value to estimate the market value for the subject property. The appraisal states that Mr.

Flood personally inspected the subject, and that the subject's highest and best use as improved is its current use.

Under the sales comparison approach, the appraisers analyzed the sales of five comparables, described as one-story, masonry, commercial buildings that range in age from 10 to 82 years old, and in size from 4,715 to 9,450 square feet of building area. All of these suggested comparables are used as an auto repair facility. These sales comparables sold from November 2006 to October 2008 for prices ranging from \$206,000 to \$475,000, or from \$42.44 to \$50.26 per square foot of building area. The appraisers adjusted each of the comparables for pertinent factors. Based on the similarities and differences of the comparables when compared to the subject, the appraisers estimated a value for the subject under the sales comparison approach of \$200,000, rounded.

The cost approach to value and the income approach to value were not developed for the appraisal. The appraisers stated that the sales comparison approach to value is considered the most reliable, and therefore, is given the most weight when appraising properties like the subject. Thus, the appraisers concluded that the subject's appraised value was \$200,000 as of January 1, 2008. 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 final assessment of \$97,836 was disclosed. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted a property record card for the subject, and raw sales data for five commercial properties located within ten miles of the subject. The sales data was collected from the CoStar Comps service, and the CoStar Comps sheets state that the research was licensed to the assessor's office. However, the board of review included a memorandum which states that the submission of these comparables is not intended to be an appraisal or an estimate of value, and should not be construed as such. The memorandum further stated that the information provided was collected from various sources, and was assumed to be factual, accurate, and reliable; but that the information had not been verified, and that the board of review did not warrant its accuracy.

The suggested comparables contained buildings that range in age from 1 to 52 years old, and in size from 3,080 to 3,798 square feet of building area. However, the board of review's evidence did not state the age of Comparable #4. The properties sold from December 1998 to August 2003 in an unadjusted range from \$150,000 to \$800,000, or from \$37.50 to \$233.10 per square foot of building area, land included. The printouts also indicate that the sales described in Comparables #2 and #4 did not include the services of any real estate brokers, and that both parties used the same real estate broker in Comparable #1. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

In rebuttal, the appellant waived the previous request for an oral hearing, and re-affirmed 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 a reduction is warranted.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board finds the best evidence to be the appraisal submitted by the appellant. The appraisers utilized the sales comparison approach to value in determining the subject's market value. The Board finds this appraisal persuasive because the appraisers have experience in appraising, and used similar properties in the sales comparison approach while providing adjustments that were necessary. Moreover, Mr. Flood personally inspected the subject.

The Board gives little weight to the board of review's comparables as the information provided was unadjusted raw sales data, and was admittedly not intended to be an estimate of value. Moreover, the most recent sale provided was from August 2003, which is more than four years years prior to the lien date of January 1, 2008 that is applicable to this appeal.

Therefore, the Board finds the subject had a market value of \$200,000 for tax year 2008. Since market value has been determined, the Cook County Real Property Classification Ordinance as in effect for tax year 2008 shall apply. The subject is classified as a class 3-97 property. Therefore, the applicable assessment is 38% of the subject's fair market value, which equates to \$76,000. The subject's current total assessed value is higher than this value, and, therefore, the Board finds 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: September 21, 2012

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.