



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

APPELLANT: Manulife Financial
DOCKET NO.: 08-30928.001-I-1
PARCEL NO.: 07-02-100-005-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Manulife Financial, the appellant(s), by attorney Terrence J. Griffin, of Eugene L. Griffin & Associates, 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:

LAND: \$ 164,209
IMPR.: \$ 687,191
TOTAL: \$ 851,400

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of 140,350 square feet of land improved with a 21-year old, one-story, masonry constructed warehouse building containing 66,384 square feet of gross building area. The appellant argued that the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in the property's assessed valuation as the basis of this appeal.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant's pleadings included a summary appraisal of the subject property with an effective date of January 1, 2007 undertaken by Daniel J. Costello, a certified general real estate appraiser and Patrick M. Kelley who holds an MAI designation and is a

certified general real estate appraiser. The appraisers estimated a market value for the subject of \$2,365,000.

The appraisal indicated that the building contains 7,200 square feet of finished office area. The appraiser indicated that the subject's highest and best use as vacant and improved is for its current use.

The appraisers developed two of the three traditional approaches to value. The appraisers developed the sales comparison and the income capitalization approaches to value.

Under the sales comparison approach to value, the appraiser utilized five sale comparables. These comparables sold from February 2004 through April 2007 for prices that ranged from \$1,355,000 to \$3,050,000 or from \$30.67 to \$38.36 per square foot. The properties ranged in building size from 38,000 to 99,456 square feet of building area. After making adjustments to the suggested comparables, the appraisers estimated that the subject's market value was \$35.00 per square foot or \$2,330,000 rounded, as of the January 1, 2007.

Under the income approach, the appraisers analyzed five lease/rental comparables and estimated the subject's net operating income at \$215,644.

The appraiser noted an overall capitalization rate for the subject based upon its size, condition and location of 9%, as well as using market survey data. Applying the overall capitalization rate of 9% to the net operating income resulted in a final value under the income approach of \$2,400,000, rounded.

The appellant's appraisers indicated equal weight was accorded to the sales comparison and the income approaches to value in reconciling a final value estimate of \$2,365,000. Based upon this data, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's market value.

The board of review submitted "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's total assessment was \$943,287 for the tax year 2007. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$2,620,241 or \$39.47 per square foot using the Cook County Ordinance Level of Assessment for Class 5, industrial property of 36%.

In support of the subject's market value, raw sales data was submitted for five industrial/warehouse properties. The data from the CoStar Comps service sheets reflect that the research was licensed to the assessor's office, but failed to indicate that there was any verification of the information or sources of data. The properties sold from January 2005, to August 2006, in an unadjusted range from \$2,500,000 to \$4,000,000 or from \$43.92 to \$51.95 per square foot of building area. The properties contained buildings that ranged in size from 50,000 to 76,282 square feet. Comparable #2 was sold as part of a bulk portfolio sale. As a result of its analysis, 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 (3d Dist. 2002; Winnbago County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 313 Ill.App.3d (2d 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 evidence indicates a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board accorded diminished weight to the properties submitted by the board of review as the evidence provided unconfirmed, raw data on sales.

Further, as to the subject's market value, the Board finds that the appellant's appraisers utilized two of the three traditional approaches to value in developing the subject's market value, The Board also finds this appraisal to be persuasive for the appraisers: have extensive experience in appraising and assessing property; personally inspected the subject property; estimated a highest and best use for the property; and utilized market data in undertaking the approaches to value; and lastly, used similar properties in the sales comparison approach while providing sufficient detail regarding each sale as well as adjustments that were necessary.

Therefore, the Board finds that the subject property contained a market value of \$2,365,000 for the tax year 2007. Since the market value of the subject has been established, the Cook County Ordinance level of assessment for Class 5, industrial property of 36% will apply. In applying this level of assessment to the subject, the total assessed value is \$851,400, while the subject's current total assessed value is above this amount at \$943,287. 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. Crit

Chairman

K. L. Fan

Member

Richard A. Huff

Member

Mario M. Lino

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: February 21, 2014

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.