



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

APPELLANT: Vito Bufano
DOCKET NO.: 10-30452.001-R-1 through 10-30452.002-R-1
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Vito Bufano, the appellant(s), by attorney Richard J. Caldarazzo, of Mar Cal Law, P.C. in Chicago; 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
10-30452.001-R-1	12-25-414-026-0000	2,578	12,058	\$ 14,636
10-30452.002-R-1	12-25-414-027-0000	2,578	18,087	\$ 20,665

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject has 6,250 square feet of land, which is improved with a 54 year old, two-story, three-unit, masonry, apartment building. The subject's improvement size is 3,220 square feet of building area, which equates to an improvement assessment of \$9.36 per square foot of building area. The appellant, via counsel, argued that there was unequal treatment in the assessment process of the subject's improvement as the basis of this appeal.

In support of the equity argument, the appellant submitted descriptive and assessment information for three properties suggested as comparable to the subject. The comparables are described as two-story, masonry or frame and masonry, five or six-unit apartment buildings. Additionally, the comparables range: in age from 50 to 51 years; in size from 5,527 to 5,772 square feet of building area; and in improvement assessments from \$7.07 to \$7.61 per square foot of building area. The

comparables also have various amenities. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's improvement assessment. The appellant also submitted a 2010 rent roll, Schedule E's from 2008 to 2009, and an income and expense analysis for the subject property. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject property's improvement assessment.

The Cook County Board of Review submitted its "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal." However, this evidence was not timely submitted, and the board of review was found to be in default under Sections 1910.40(a) and 1910.69(a) of the Official Rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board. Therefore, the board of review's evidence was not considered in this appeal.

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 appellant contends unequal treatment in the subject's improvement assessment as the basis of this appeal. Taxpayers who object to an assessment on the basis of lack of uniformity bear the burden of proving the disparity of assessment valuations by clear and convincing evidence. Walsh v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 181 Ill. 2d 228, 234 (1998) (citing Kankakee Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 131 Ill. 2d 1 (1989)); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.63(e). To succeed in an appeal based on lack of uniformity, the appellant must submit documentation "showing the similarity, proximity and lack of distinguishing characteristics of the assessment comparables to the subject property." Cook Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 403 Ill. App. 3d 139, 145 (1st Dist. 2010); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.65(b). "[T]he critical consideration is not the number of allegedly similar properties, but whether they are in fact 'comparable' to the subject property." Cook Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 403 Ill. App. 3d at 145 (citing DuPage Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 284 Ill. App. 3d 649, 654-55 (2d Dist. 1996)). After an analysis of the assessment data, the Board finds that the appellant has not met this burden.

The Board finds that none of the comparables submitted by the appellant were similar to the subject in size, style, and features. The subject has three units while the suggested comparables have five or six units. In addition, the subject contains 3,220 square feet of living area while the suggested

comparables range in size from 5,527 to 5,772 square feet of living area. As such, the Board finds that the appellant has not met the burden of clear and convincing evidence, as there is no range of equity comparables with which to compare the subject. Therefore, the Board finds the subject's improvement assessment is equitable and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

Additionally, the appellant submitted documentation showing the income of the subject property. The PTAB gives the appellant's argument little weight. In Springfield Marine Bank v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 44 Ill.2d 428 (1970), the court stated:

[I]t is the value of the "tract or lot of real property" which is assessed, rather than the value of the interest presently held. . . [R]ental income may of course be a relevant factor. However, it cannot be the controlling factor, particularly where it is admittedly misleading as to the fair cash value of the property involved. . . [E]arning capacity is properly regarded as the most significant element in arriving at "fair cash value".

Many factors may prevent a property owner from realizing an income from property that accurately reflects its true earning capacity; but it is the capacity for earning income, rather than the income actually derived, which reflects "fair cash value" for taxation purposes. Id. at 431.

Actual expenses and income based on vacancy can be useful when shown that they are reflective of the market. Although the appellant's attorney made this argument, the appellant did not demonstrate through an expert in real estate valuation that the subject's actual income and expenses are reflective of the market. To demonstrate or estimate the subject's market value using income, one must establish, through the use of market data, the market rent, vacancy and collection losses, and expenses to arrive at a net operating income reflective of the market and the property's capacity for earning income. The appellant did not provide such evidence and, therefore, the Board gives no weight to this evidence and finds that a reduction based on market value is not 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.



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: May 21, 2014



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.