

# FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: MetroBank

DOCKET NO.: 12-21564.001-R-1 PARCEL NO.: 16-20-105-034-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are MetroBank, the appellant, by attorney Brian P. Liston, of the Law Offices of Liston & Tsantilis, 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:

**LAND:** \$ 3,047 **IMPR.:** \$ 14,953 **TOTAL:** \$ 18,000

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 2012 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 a 108 year-old, two-story building of masonry construction and containing 4,737 square feet of living area, with one commercial space on the first floor and three rental apartments on the second floor. Features of the building include a partial unfinished basement. The property has a 4,353 square foot site and is located in Cicero Township, Cook County. The property is a Class 2-12 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

Docket No: 12-21564.001-R-1

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted an appraisal using the sales comparison and income approaches to estimate the subject property had a reconciled market value of \$165,000 as of January 5, 2012. The appraisal did not include a qualitative and quantitative analysis with adjustments to the four comparable properties cited for the sales comparison approach. These sales comparables were for buildings with a commercial space and rental residential apartments. For the income approach, the appraisal included real estate taxes in its calculation of expenses and a capitalization rate of 16.00%.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$19,182. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$191,182, or \$43.92 per square foot of living area including land, when applying the 2012 level of assessment of 10.00% for Class 2 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 equity comparables.

#### 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 no adjustments were made to account for any differences between the subject and the comparables cited in the appraisal. The income approach included real estate taxes in the appraisal's calculation of expenses and capitalization rate applied to net annual income. Consequently, the appraisal lacked sufficient qualitative and quantitative analysis of the comparable properties cited to result in a reliable conclusion and opinion of the subject's market value. However, the appraisal did include raw, unadjusted sales data of four comparable properties. In contrast, the board of review failed to submit any sales comparables. After considering the differences and similarities of the subject to the appellant's sales comparables in the appraisal, the Board finds the assessment of the subject property warrants a reduction.

Docket No: 12-21564.001-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

Chairman

Member

Member

Acting Member

Member

Member

Member

Member

Member

## 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 22, 2016

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

Docket No: 12-21564.001-R-1

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.