



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

APPELLANT: Christine Okelman
DOCKET NO.: 11-29933.001-C-1 through 11-29933.002-C-1
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Christine Okelman, the appellant, by attorney George N. Reveliotis, of Reveliotis Law, P.C. in Park Ridge; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented in this matter, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds **A Reduction** 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
11-29933.001-C-1	29-29-308-022-0000	9,077	5,000	\$14,077
11-29933.002-C-1	29-29-308-023-0000	9,573	100	\$9,673

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 contains a 21 year-old, one and part two-story warehouse and office building of masonry construction. The parties differed as to the square foot size of the building. The subject property has a 34,336 square foot site and is located in Thornton Township, Cook County and is a Class 5 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 \$95,000 as of January 1, 2011. The appraisal disclosed the subject contained 6,438 square feet of building area. The appellant requested a total assessment reduction to \$23,750 when applying the 2011 level of assessment of 25.00% for Class 5 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$39,430. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$157,720 when applying the 2011 level of assessment of 25.00% for Class 5 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted information on four unadjusted suggested sales comparables. The board of review's evidence disclosed the building contained 7,158 square feet of building area.

At hearing, the appellant offered Susan Ulman as an expert witness. The Board accepted Ulman as an expert in the theory and practice of real estate appraisal without objection from the board of review. Ulman was the president of Zimmerman Real Estate Group, the company that prepared the appellant's appraisal report. She assigned the appraisal job to Shawn Schneider, an appraiser in her company. Ulman testified that Schneider selected six sales comparables from a sample of approximately 20 recent sales. She supervised his work and reviewed the 20 sales in the sample as well as the six sales comparables selected for preparation of the appraisal report. She also looked at other sales comparables, but ultimately concurred with Schneider with his selection of the six comparables used in the report. Ulman testified that both she and Schneider signed the report and that she adopted it as her work. She stated that the subject contained a 6,438 square foot free-standing retail building situated on a 34,336 square foot site, and that the building and parking lot exhibited physical deterioration. She testified that the existing improvement were used as a distribution facility and had little potential for alternative use. Ulman testified that each comparable was adjusted in comparison to the subject based on whether the comparable was inferior, superior or not significantly different than the subject on a variety of key property characteristics. Ulman opined that the subject's market value was \$95,000. The board of review representative rested on the evidence previously submitted.

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, for the purposes of this appeal, the subject contained 6,438 square feet of building area because the appraisal included a statement that a personal inspection of the property was made. The Board further finds the best evidence of market value to be the appraisal submitted by the appellant. The Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$95,000 as of the assessment date at issue. Since market value has been established, the 2011 level of assessment of 25.00% for Class 5 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance shall apply.

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.