



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

APPELLANT: Arturo I. Lema
DOCKET NO.: 10-22690.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 16-30-103-001-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Arturo I. Lema, the appellant(s), by attorney Steven B. Pearlman, of Steven B. Pearlman & Associates in Chicago; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds a 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:

LAND: \$ 3,390
IMPR.: \$45,081
TOTAL: \$48,471

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 2010 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 two-story dwelling of masonry construction with 6,360 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1980. Features of the home include a partial

basement and central air conditioning. The property has a 4,238 square foot site and is located in Berwyn, Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-12 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant contends assessment inequity as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted information on three equity comparables.

As to the appellant's second issue, the appellant's attorney argues that a vacancy factor should be applied to the subject. In support of this assertion, appellant submits several photos and the subject's actual income and expense data.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing that the total assessment for the subject of \$48,471. The subject property has an improvement assessment of 45,081 or 7.09 per square foot of living area. In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four equity comparables.

Conclusion of Law

The taxpayer 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 best evidence of assessment equity to be *appellant's comparable #1 and the board of review's comparables # 2 and #4*. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$3.65 to \$7.90 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$7.09 per square foot of living area falls *within* the range established by the best comparables in this record. Based on this record the Board finds the appellant *did not* demonstrate with clear and convincing evidence that the subject's improvement was inequitably assessed and a reduction in the subject's assessment *is not justified*.

When overvaluation is claimed the appellant has the burden of proving the value of the property by a preponderance of the evidence. National City Bank of Michigan/Illinois v. Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board, 331 Ill.App.3d 1038 (3rd Dist. 2002); Winnebago County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 313 Ill.App.3d 179 (2nd Dist. 2000). 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. 86 Ill.Admin.Code 1910.65(c). Having considered the market value evidence presented, the Board finds that the appellant did not meet this burden and that a reduction is not warranted.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board looks to the evidence and arguments presented by the parties.

The appellant submitted documentation showing the income and expenses 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. The Board gives this argument little weight because the parties failed to submit market data. Furthermore, the Board finds unpersuasive the appellant's question regarding vacancy, which was unsupported by market data.

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

K. L. Fan

Klaus Albrecht

Member

Member

JR

Jerry White

Member

Acting Member

Robert Steffen

Acting 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: November 20, 2015

A. Proctor

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.