

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: 545 W. Stratford Place

DOCKET NO.: 11-25031.001-R-1 through 11-25031.004-R-1

PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are 545 W. Stratford Place, the appellant, 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 <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:

DOCKET NO	PARCEL NUMBER	LAND	IMPRVMT	TOTAL
11-25031.001-R-1	14-21-306-041-1001	3,763	9,903	\$13,666
11-25031.002-R-1	14-21-306-041-1002	14,112	37,134	\$51,246
11-25031.003-R-1	14-21-306-041-1003	14,112	37,134	\$51,246
11-25031.004-R-1	14-21-306-041-1004	15,052	39,610	\$54,662

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 2011 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 is 104 years old, and consists of a three-story dwelling of masonry construction containing four condominium units. The property has an 8,400 square foot site and is located in Lake View Township, Cook County. The property is a class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted an appraisal estimating the subject property had a market value of \$1,800,000 as of January 1, 2009.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$270,158. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$2,846,765 when applying the 2011 three-year median level of assessment of 9.49% for class 2 property as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted a condominium analysis for the subject disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$270,158. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$223,119. In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted information on a suggested comparable sale for one unit in the building that sold in 2006 for \$950,000. The board of review selected the 2006 sale for \$950,000 for its condominium analysis. The board of review applied a 2% market value reduction to the subject for personal property without further evidence to arrive at a full market value of \$931,000 of the selected unit sold. The board of review disclosed the unit sold consisted of 32.00% of all units in the building. The result was a full value of the building at \$2,909,375.

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 the best evidence of market value to be the appraisal submitted by the appellant. The subject's assessment reflects a market value above the best evidence of market value in the record. The Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$1,800,000 as of the assessment date at issue. Since market value has been established, the 2011 three-year median level of assessment of 9.49% for class 2 property as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue shall apply. (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(c)(2)).

Docket No: 11-25031.001-R-1 through 11-25031.004-R-1

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	a 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:	April 24, 2015
-	Alpotol
=	Clark of the Droporty Tay Appeal Board

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 <u>PETITION AND EVIDENCE</u> 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.