



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

APPELLANT: William & Linda Metz
DOCKET NO.: 10-21361.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 14-28-303-018-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are William & Linda Metz, the appellant(s); 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: \$16,960
IMPR.: \$68,864
TOTAL: \$85,824**

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject has 2,650 square feet of land, which is improved with a 122-year old, two-story, frame constructed, multi-family dwelling with two improvements. Improvements #1 is a two-story dwelling with three units containing 2,280 square feet of living area. Improvement #2 is a two-story, multi-family dwelling with two units containing 1,344 square feet. The subject's total improvement size is 3,624 square feet of living area, and its total assessment is \$118,202. This assessment yields a fair market value of \$1,322,170, or \$364.84 per square foot of living area (including land), after applying the 2010 Illinois Department of Revenue three year median level of assessment for Class 2 properties of 8.94%. The appellants argued unequal treatment in the assessment process and that the subject's market value is not accurately reflected in the assessed value as the bases of the appeal.

In support of the market value argument, the appellants submitted a residential appraisal report for the subject property with an effective date of December 4, 2009. The appraiser estimated a fair market value for the subject of \$960,000 utilizing the sales comparison approach to value. The appraiser also conducted an inspection of the subject.

Under the sales comparison approach to value, the appraiser utilized six sales comparables. The comparables are described as two-story, frame or masonry constructed, multi-family dwellings. Additionally, the comparables are from 112 to 122 years old, and have from 2,117 to 3,629 square feet of living area. The comparables sold between December 2007 and October 2009 for \$827,500 to \$972,500, or \$271.70 to \$390.88 per square foot of living area, including land. Two of the comparables have not sold and listed for \$975,000 and \$1,099,000 or \$270.36 and \$322.53 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's improvement assessment.

In addition, the appellants submitted three sales comparables that are located within one mile of the subject. The comparables are described as two or three-story, frame constructed, multi-family dwellings. Additionally, the comparables are from 118 to 131 years old, and have from 3,381 to 4,065 square feet of living area. The comparables sold between May 2010 and February 2011 for \$750,000 to \$985,000, or \$221.11 to \$242.31 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's improvement assessment.

In support of the equity argument, the appellant submitted descriptions and assessment information on a total of five properties suggested as comparable and located within one block of the subject property. The properties are described as two or three-story, masonry, frame or frame and masonry, multi-family dwellings with between three and four baths. The properties range: in age from 121 to 136 years; in size from 2,760 to 3,655 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$18.29 to \$23.33 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's improvement assessment.

The Cook County Board of Review submitted its "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal," wherein the subject's total assessment of \$118,202 was disclosed. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted descriptive and assessment information for three properties suggested as comparable to the subject's improvement #1. The comparables are described as two-story, frame, multi-family dwellings. Additionally, the comparables range: in age from 107 to 121 years; in size from 2,070 to 2,360 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$24.30 to \$30.88 per square foot of living area. The comparables also have several amenities.

The board of review also submitted three properties suggested as comparable to the subject's improvement #2. The comparables are described as two-story, frame, multi-family dwellings. Additionally, the comparables range: in age from 121 to 131 years; in size from 1,773 to 2008 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$27.12 to \$29.85 per square foot

of living area. The comparables also have several amenities. 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 indicates a reduction is warranted.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board finds the best evidence to be the appellants' appraisal. The appellants' appraiser utilized the 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 \$960,000 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 \$85,824, 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.

Ronald R. Cuit

Chairman

Frank J. Huff

Member

Mark Morris

Member

JR

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: May 24, 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.