



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

APPELLANT: Neal Management  
DOCKET NO.: 09-27819.001-C-1 through 09-27819.003-C-1  
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Neal Management, the appellant(s), by attorney Arnold G. Siegel, of Siegel & Callahan, 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
09-27819.001-C-1	02-23-218-006-0000	15,056	45,656	\$60,712
09-27819.002-C-1	02-23-218-018-0000	30,937	64,737	\$95,674
09-27819.003-C-1	02-23-218-020-0000	14,148	1,223	\$15,371

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 three parcels of land totaling 29,160 square feet and improved with a 42-year old, one and part two-story, commercial building. The property is located in Palatine Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 5 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant contended both inequity and overvaluation as the bases of the appeal. In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted copies of the subject's rent roll and 2006 through 2008 income and expense statements. The appellant's attorney submitted a brief applying an attorney developed capitalization rate to the subject's actual income to arrive at an attorney estimated value for the subject.

In support of the equity argument the appellant submitted three equity comparables with assessments from \$10.90 to \$19.18 per square foot of building area. The appellant also included copies of the county assessor's web page printouts disclosing that the three comparables' assessments are partial assessments.

In addition, the appellant asserted the subject contains 2,381 square feet of building area. To support this, the appellant submitted the property record card for one parcel of the subject showing this portion contains 2,381 square feet of building area.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$171,757 with an improvement assessment of \$111,616. In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted four sales comparables.

The board of review lists the subject's improvement as containing 8,461 square feet of building area. In support of this, the board of review submitted property record cards for all three parcels.

#### Conclusion of Law

As to the subject's size, the Board finds the appellant failed to show the county has incorrectly listed the subject's improvement size. Therefore, the Board finds the subject contains 8,461 square feet of building area which reflects an assessment of \$13.19 per square foot of building area.

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 did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The appellant submitted documentation showing the income of the subject property. The Board 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 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 this argument no weight and that a reduction based on the subject actual income is not warranted.

The appellant also contends assessment inequity as the basis of the appeal. When unequal treatment in the assessment process is the basis of the appeal, the inequity of the assessments must be proved by clear and convincing evidence. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). Proof of unequal treatment in the assessment process should consist of documentation of the assessments for the assessment year in question of not less than three comparable properties showing the similarity, proximity and lack of distinguishing characteristics of the assessment comparables to the subject property. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(b). The Board finds the appellant did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The Board finds the appellant submitted evidence on three equity comparables that are similar to the subject. However, the evidence shows these assessments are partial assessments with no further information as to why they are partial or what percentage of the total assessment the partial assessments are. Without this information, the Board is unable to determine if the subject is over assessed when compared to the same degree of partial assessment or total assessment of the comparables. Therefore, the Board finds the appellant failed to show by clear and convincing evidence that the subject is over assessed and a reduction based on equity is not justified.

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

*Tracy A. Huff*

Member

*Marko M. Louie*

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: February 20, 2015

*A. P. ...*

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.