

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Margaret Piton

DOCKET NO.: 12-21793.001-C-1 through 12-21793.002-C-1

PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Margaret Piton, the appellant(s), by attorney Donald T. Rubin, of Rubin & Associates, LLC in Chicago; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented in this matter, 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
12-21793.001-C-1	19-18-108-023-0000	9,262	24,555	\$33,817
12-21793.002-C-1	19-18-108-024-0000	9,668	24,555	\$34,223

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 (Board) finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of the appeal.

Findings of Fact

The subject property consists of two parcels of land improved with a 41-year old, one-story, masonry, commercial building. The property is located in Lake Township, Cook County and is classified as 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 sales information on nine comparables. The appellant lists the subject as containing 3,504 square feet of building area with no further information.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$78,838. The subject's total assessment reflects a market value of \$315,352 using the Cook County Ordinance level of assessment of 25% for class 5 properties.

The board of review lists the subject as containing 3,888 square feet of building area and, to support this, includes a copy of the property record card with a diagram of the perimeter of the building.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted six sales comparables.

Conclusion of Law

As to the subject's size, the Board finds the appellant failed to present sufficient evidence to show that the county had incorrectly listed the subject's size. In contrast, the board of review included a diagram of the perimeter of the subject improvement. Therefore, the Board finds the subject contains 3,888 square feet of building area and that the assessment reflects a market value of \$81.11 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 best evidence of market value are the appellant's comparables #1, #4, #5, #7, #8, and #9 and the board of review's comparable #3. These properties sold from August 2010 to December 2012 for prices ranging from \$36.19 to \$72.22 per square foot of building area. In comparison, the appellant's assessment reflects a market value of \$81.11 per square foot of building area which is above the range established by the comparables. Based on the record and after adjustments to the comparables, the Board finds the appellant did demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the subject was overvalued and a reduction is 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.

	Mauro Illorioso	
Chairman		
	R	
Member	Member	
	Robert Stoffen	
Member	Member	
DISSENTING:		
<u>C</u> :	<u>ERTIFICATION</u>	
hereby certify that the foregoing is a t	Appeal Board and the keeper of the Records thereof, I do rue, full and complete Final Administrative Decision of the ed this date in the above entitled appeal, now of record in this	
Date:	June 24, 2016	
	Afrotol	
	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.