



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

APPELLANT: Royal B. Martin  
DOCKET NO.: 09-31529.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 05-20-409-004-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Royal B. Martin, the appellant(s), by attorney David R. Bass, of Thompson Coburn LLP 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:** \$ 29,452  
**IMPR.:** \$ 66,223  
**TOTAL:** \$ 95,675

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject has 18,700 square feet of land, which is improved with an 83 year old, two-story, frame and masonry, single-family dwelling. According to the appellant's appraisal, the subject's improvement size is 3,255 square feet of living area, and its total assessment is \$130,324. This assessment yields a fair market value of \$1,464,315, or \$449.87 per square foot of living area (including land), after applying the 2009 Illinois Department of Revenue three year median level of assessment for Class 2 properties of 8.90%. 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 a residential appraisal report for the subject property with an effective date of January 1, 2009. The appraiser estimated a fair market value for the subject of \$1,075,000 based on the cost and sales comparison approaches to value. The appraiser also conducted an inspection of the subject.

The appellant also argued that the subject's assessment should be reduced because the board of review reduced its 2010 assessment to \$107,500 based on the same appraisal submitted in this appeal.

The appellant cites Hoyne Sav. & Loan v. Hare, 60 Ill. 2d 84 (1974) and 400 Condominium Assoc. v. Tully, 79 Ill. App. 3d 686 (1979) in support of this argument. 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 total assessment of \$130,324 was disclosed. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted descriptive and assessment information for four properties suggested as comparable to the subject. The comparables are described as two-story, frame and masonry, single-family dwellings. Additionally, the comparables range: in age from 70 to 91 years; in size from 3,270 to 3,674 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$30.46 to \$41.17 per square foot of living area. The comparables also have several amenities. The board of review's grid sheet also states that Comparable #2 sold in June 2008 for \$1,205,000, or \$368.50 per square foot of living area, including land; and that Comparable #3 sold in May 2007 for \$1,500,000, or \$408.27 per square foot of living area, including land. 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 (the "Board") finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal.

The Board recognizes that Section 16-185 of the Property Tax Code states that a prior year's decision lowering the assessment should be carried forward to the 2009 tax year, subject only to equalization, when the property is an owner occupied residence and the tax years are within the same general assessment period. 35 ILCS 200/16-185. However, in this case, the Board finds that doing so would result in an inequitable assessment in contravention of the Board's authority to base each decision upon equity and the weight of the evidence. 35 ILCS 200/16 185.

The Board takes notice that the Cook County Board of Commissioners passed Ordinance No. 08-0-51 (the "10/25 Ordinance"), which amended Chapter 74, Article II, Division 2, Section 74-64 of the Cook County Code of Ordinances, and is effective for tax year 2009. See 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.90(i). The 10/25 Ordinance changed the statutory assessment classification level of assessments for class 2 property throughout Cook County from 16% to 10%. The Board finds that carrying forward the assessment from the previous tax year to the 2009 tax year without recognizing the fact that assessment levels were reduced in Cook County for tax year 2009 is inequitable since the previous year's decision was founded on a substantially higher level of assessment. The Uniformity Clause of the Illinois Constitution states that, "Except as otherwise provided in this Section, taxes upon real property shall be levied uniformly by valuation ascertained as the General Assembly shall provide by law." Ill. Const. 1970, art. IX, § 4(a).

Taxation must be uniform in the basis of assessment as well as the rate of taxation. Apex Motor Fuel Co. v. Barrett, 20 Ill. 2d 395, 401 (1960). Taxation must be in proportion to the value of the property being taxed. It is unconstitutional for one kind of property within a taxing district to be taxed as a certain proportion of its market value while the same kind of property in the same taxing district is taxed as a substantially higher or lower proportion of its market value. Kankakee Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 131 Ill. 2d 1, 20 (1989); Apex Motor Fuel, 20 Ill. 2d at 401; Walsh v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 181 Ill. 2d 228, 234 (1998). The Board finds that carrying forward the decision from the previous tax year to tax year 2009 would violate this directive.

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 warranted.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board finds the best evidence to be the appellant's appraisal. The appellant's appraiser utilized the cost and sales comparison approaches to value in determining the subject's market value. The Board finds this appraisal persuasive because the appraiser has experience in appraising, personally inspected the subject property, reviewed the property's history, and used similar properties in the sales comparison approach while providing adjustments that were necessary. The Board gives little weight to the board of review's evidence as it was raw sales data that did not make any adjustments for age, exterior construction, improvement size, improvement type, location, or market conditions.

Therefore, the Board finds the subject had a market value of \$1,075,000 for the 2009 assessment year. Since the market value of this parcel has been established, the 2009 Illinois Department of Revenue three year median level of assessment for Class 2 property of 8.90% will apply. 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.50(c)(2)(A). In applying this level of assessment to the subject, the total assessed value is \$95,675, while the subject's current total assessed value is above this amount. Therefore, the Board finds that a reduction is warranted. Moreover, the Board finds that since the subject's 2010 assessment and the now revised 2009 assessment were both based on the appraisal

submitted by the appellant, the argument based on Hoyne and 400 Condominium Assoc. has been adequately addressed by the Board in its finding that the appraisal is the best evidence of the subject's fair market value as of the assessment date.

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.

*Donald R. Cuit*

Chairman

*K. L. Fern*

Member

*Frank A. Huff*

Member

*Mark Morris*

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: June 21, 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.