



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

APPELLANT: Justin Beger
DOCKET NO.: 10-21360.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 14-29-122-058-1002

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Justin Beger, the appellant; 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: \$ 3,662
IMPR: \$ 32,098
TOTAL: \$ 35,760

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of a condominium unit located in a five-story, 8 unit condominium building. The subject condominium is located on the building's second floor and contains 1,412 square feet of living area as well as two bathrooms.

The appellant argued that the market value of the subject property was not accurately reflected in its assessed value as the bases of this appeal.

In support of this argument, the appellant submitted data that the subject sold on October 20, 2009 for a price of \$395,000. In addition, the appellant submitted a copy of the settlement statement.

Moreover, the appellant submitted an appraisal undertaken by Michael Micenko, who is licensed as a State of Illinois certified residential real estate appraiser. The appraiser stated that the subject had an estimated market value of \$400,000 as of November 3, 2010. The appraisal report utilized one of the traditional approaches to value to estimate the market value for the subject property. The appraisal report stated that the property rights appraised were a fee simple estate and that appraiser personally inspected the subject property. Based upon the appraiser's

inspection, he estimated that the subject's unit size was 1,412 square feet of living area, which was reflected in the attached floor plan with size calculations thereon.

Under the sales comparison approach, the appraiser analyzed the sales of four suggested comparables, with only one located in the subject's building. In addition, data was provided on 2 listing properties. Each of the four sale properties contain a condominium unit located from the second to fourth floors of condominium buildings. These range in age from 1 to 3 years and in improvement size from 1,162 to 1,468 square feet of living area. These suggested comparables sold from March, 2010, to August, 2010, for prices that ranged from \$379,900 to \$439,000 or from \$275.89 to \$337.69 per square foot. The appraiser adjusted each of the comparables for pertinent factors. Based on the similarities and differences of the comparables when compared to the subject, the appraiser estimated a value for the subject under the sales comparison approach to value of \$400,000 or \$283.29 per square foot. 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 \$46,961 was disclosed. The subject's final assessment yields a fair market value of \$525,291 when the 2010 Illinois Department of Revenue three-year median level of assessment for Class 2 properties of 8.94% is applied.

In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review presented a seven-line condominium analysis relating to one unit which sold in the subject's building. The unit sold on January 1, 2010 for \$484,150, while this unit was allocated an ownership percentage of 11.74%. A deduction for personal property was estimated at 2% resulting in an adjusted consideration of \$474,467. Applying the unit's ownership percentage resulted in a full value estimate of the building at \$4,041,457 resulting in a value estimate of the subject of \$474,467. 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.

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 indicated 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 one of the three traditional 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, and used similar properties in the sales comparison approach while providing adjustments that were necessary to this market data. Moreover, the Board finds that the subject's actual sale price supports this appraisal's market value opinion.

Further, the Board accords little weight to the board of review's analysis comprising only one sale property and questionable methodology.

Therefore, the Board finds the subject had a market value of \$400,000 for the 2010 assessment year. Since the market value of this parcel has been established, the 2010 Illinois Department of Revenue three-year median level of assessment for Class 2 property of 8.94% 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 \$35,760, while the subject's current total assessed value is above this amount. 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.

Donald 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: April 19, 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.