



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

APPELLANT: Jeff Poczatek  
DOCKET NO.: 09-23353.001-I-1 through 09-23353.002-I-1  
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Jeff Poczatek, the appellant, by attorney Edward Larkin, of Larkin & Larkin in Park Ridge; 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:

DOCKET NO	PARCEL NUMBER	LAND	IMPRVMT	TOTAL
09-23353.001-I-1	10-23-324-043-0000	9,225	0	\$9,225
09-23353.002-I-1	10-23-324-045-0000	22,101	107,084	\$129,185

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property has 17,835 square feet of land, which is improved with a 54 year old, one-story, masonry, industrial building. The subject's improvement size is 11,400 square feet of building area, and its total assessment is \$138,410. This assessment yields a fair market value of \$608,990, or \$53.42 per square foot of building area (including land), after applying the 22.73% blended assessment level for industrial and vacant land properties under the 2009 Cook County Classification of Real Property Ordinance. 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 an industrial appraisal report for the subject property with an effective date of January 1, 2007. The appraiser estimated a fair market value for the subject of \$350,000 based on the cost, income, and sales comparison approaches to value. Four of the seven sales used by the appraiser were from 2003 and two sales were from 2004. The appraiser also conducted an inspection of

the subject. 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 \$138,410 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 industrial buildings located within three 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 Cook County 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 states 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 comparables are described as one-story, masonry, industrial buildings. Additionally, the comparables are from 26 to 47 years old and have from 9,300 to 12,000 square feet of building area. The comparables sold between May 2004 and November 2007 for \$550,000 to \$1,180,000, or \$59.14 to \$105.09 per square foot of building area, including land. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

After reviewing the record, considering the evidence, and hearing the testimony, 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 not warranted.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board finds that six of the seven comparables' sale dates in the appellant's appraisal are too far removed from the lien date to accurately reflect the subject's market value as of January 1, 2009.

Additionally, no weight was given to the comparables provided by the board of review as they were not adjusted for market conditions or verified by the board of review.

Accordingly, in determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board finds that the appellant failed to submit sufficient evidence to show the subject was overvalued. Therefore, the Board finds that the appellant has not met its burden by a preponderance of the evidence and that the subject does not warrant a reduction based upon the market data submitted into evidence.

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: July 19, 2013



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.