



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

APPELLANT: Irene Mojica  
DOCKET NO.: 09-29994.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 17-18-304-039-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Irene Mojica, the appellant, by attorney Timothy C. Jacobs of Gary H. Smith PC 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: \$7,765  
IMPR.: \$32,285  
TOTAL: \$40,050**

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a two-story multi-family dwelling of masonry construction. The dwelling is approximately 118 years old. The dwelling contains approximately 3,120 square feet of living area.<sup>1</sup> Features include three apartment units and a full basement that is partially finished for an apartment. The property has a 2,413 square foot site and is located in Chicago, West Chicago Township, Cook County.

The appellant's appeal is based on overvaluation. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted an appraisal estimating the subject property had a market value of \$450,000 or \$144.23 per square foot of living area, land included, as of December 28, 2009. The appraisal was prepared by Patrick J. Dunne, a State of Illinois Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser.

---

<sup>1</sup> Parties differed on size. Given the record, the appraiser's data is accepted as having better support.

In estimating the market value of the subject property, the appraiser developed all three approaches to value.

Under the cost approach, the appraiser estimated the subject had a site value of \$152,000. The appraiser estimated the replacement cost new of the improvements to be \$358,800. The appraiser estimated depreciation to be \$62,400 resulting in a depreciated improvement value of \$296,400. The appraiser also estimated the site improvements had a value of \$2,000. Adding the various components, the appraiser estimated the subject property had an indicated value of \$450,400 under the cost approach to value.

Under the income approach, the appraiser identified the subject's gross monthly rent as \$2,825 for the subject's three apartment units. The appraiser applied a gross rent multiplier of 160 to the subject's gross monthly rent to arrive at an indicated value under the income approach of \$452,000.

Under the sales comparison approach, the appraiser provided information on three comparable sales described as multi-family dwellings of masonry construction. The dwellings range in age from 14 to 84 years and in size from 2,116 to 3,561 square feet of living area. Each comparable has three apartment units and full basements. Comparable #3 has central air conditioning. Comparable #2 has a two-car garage. The comparables have sites of 2,772 or 3,125 square feet of land area. The comparables sold from February to November 2009 for prices ranging from \$395,000 to \$450,000 or from \$126.37 to \$199.43 per square foot of living area, including land.<sup>2</sup> After making adjustments to the comparables for differences from the subject, the appraiser estimated the comparables had adjusted prices ranging from \$447,100 to \$466,718 or from \$125.81 to \$211.29 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this data, the appraiser estimated the subject property had an indicated value under the sales comparison approach of \$450,000.

In reconciling the three approaches to value, the appraiser gave the most weight to the sales comparison approach to value and estimated the subject property had a market value of \$450,000 as of December 28, 2009. Based on this evidence, the appellant's attorney requested that subject's assessment be calculated by applying the 10% ordinance level of assessments for Class 2 residential property in Cook County to the estimate of market value contained in the appraisal report. Based on this record,

---

<sup>2</sup> The appraiser noted that the sale of comparable #1 was pending and that comparables #2 and #3 were sold due to foreclosure or a "short" sale.

counsel requested the subject's total assessment be reduced to \$45,000.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's total assessment of \$52,330 was disclosed. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$587,978 or \$188.45 per square foot of living area, including land, when applying the 2009 three year average median level of assessments for class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance of 8.90% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted information on four suggested equity comparables and provided a sale price for one of these comparables. Comparable #3 sold in September 2006 for \$600,000 or for \$209.42 per square feet of living area, land included. Comparable #3 is a three-story multi-family dwelling of masonry construction. The dwelling is approximately 109 years old and contains 2,865 square feet of living area. Features include three apartment units and a full unfinished basement. The board of review also presented a list of twenty properties that sold from February 1991 to October 2007 for prices that ranged from \$50,000 to \$570,000. Descriptive data for these sale properties was not provided. Based on this evidence, the board of review 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 Board further finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The appellant contends the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in its assessed valuation. When market value is the basis of the appeal the value of the property must be proved 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); 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). Proof of market value may consist of an appraisal of the subject property, a recent sale, comparable sales or construction costs. (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(c)). The Board finds the appellant met this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The Board finds the appellant's appraisal report is the best evidence of the subject's market value as of the January 1, 2009

assessment date. The appraiser estimated a market value of \$450,000 or \$144.23 per square foot of living area, land included, for the subject property as of December 28, 2009. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$587,978 or \$188.45 per square foot of living area, land included, using the 2009 three year median level of assessments for Class 2 property in Cook County of 8.90% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue. The subject's market value as reflected by its assessment is in excess of the market value estimate contained in the appraisal report.

The Board finds that the board of review was not able to refute the appellant's overvaluation argument. The board of review presented four equity comparables and provided a sale price for one of these comparables. This sale occurred in September 2006, which was not as proximate in time to the January 1, 2009 assessment date as the comparable sales utilized in the appraisal report. Consequently, the Board gave little weight to this evidence. The board of review also provided a list of twenty sale properties but no descriptive data for these properties was given. As a result, no weight was given to this evidence.

Based on this record, the Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$450,000 as of the January 1, 2009 assessment date. Since market value has been determined, the 2009 three year average median level of assessments for class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance of 8.90% shall apply. (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(c)(2)).

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

*Tracy 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: March 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.