

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Manus McClafferty
DOCKET NO.: 09-22587.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 14-29-101-052-1004

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Manus McClafferty, the appellant, by attorney James E. Doherty, of Thomas M. Tully & Associates in Chicago; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds <u>a reduction</u> 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: \$ 4,611 **IMPR.:** \$49,670 **TOTAL:** \$54,281

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Cook County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2009 tax year. The Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of the appeal.

Findings of Fact

The subject property consists of a three-year old residential condominium unit. The property is located in Lake View Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant's appeal is based on overvaluation. In support of this argument the appellant submitted evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased on April 25, 2007 for a price of \$609,900. In addition, the appellant argued that he has recently entered into a real estate contract to sell an identical unit at 1420 West Belmont for \$500,000. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to reflect the purchase price.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$60,999. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$685,382 when using the 2009 three year median level of assessments for class 2 property of 8.90% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted a report estimating the market value of the subject building based on the 2007 sale of the subject property.

Conclusion of Law

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. 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 that the appellant failed to present sufficient evidence to show that the two units are comparable. The appellant did not present any descriptive information of the 1420 West Belmont unit for the Board to use as a comparable. In addition, the appellant failed to present a sales contract or settlement statement for the 1420 West Belmont unit.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the purchase of the subject property in April, 2007 for a price of \$609,900. The appellant provided evidence demonstrating the sale had the elements of an arm's length transaction. In further support of the transaction the appellant submitted a copy of the settlement statement. The Board finds the purchase price is below the market value reflected by the assessment.

The Board finds the board of review did not present any evidence to challenge the arm's length nature of the transaction or to refute the contention that the purchase price was reflective of market value. On the contrary, the board of review based its assessment of market value on the sale of the subject property. Based on this record the Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$609,900 as of January 1, 2009. Since market value has been determined the 2009 three year median level of assessments for class 2 property 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.

	Chairman
21. Fe	
Member	Member
Mauro Illorias	C R
Member	Member
DISSENTING:	

CERTIFICATION

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 22, 2015
	Alportol
•	Clerk of the Property Tax Appeal Board

ciein of the froperty fan hopear 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.