

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: James Depree
DOCKET NO.: 12-23187.001-C-1
PARCEL NO.: 14-20-101-028-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are James Depree, the appellant(s), 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 *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: \$23,625 **IMPR.:** \$71,565 **TOTAL:** \$95,190

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 a 6,300 square foot parcel of land improved with an 89-year old, three-story, masonry, apartment building. The property is located in Lake View Township, Cook County and is classified as a class 3 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 three comparables. The appellant lists the subject's improvement size as 13,775 square feet of building area with no further information in regards to the improvement size.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$95,190. The subject's total assessment reflects a market value of \$951,900 using the Cook County Ordinance level of assessment of 10% for class 3 properties.

Docket No: 12-23187.001-C-1

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted four sales comparables. The board of review lists the subject's improvement size as 12,447 square feet of building area and includes the property record cards to support this.

In rebuttal, the appellant submitted a letter asserting that the board of review's comparables were not adjusted, did not include substantive information, and were not located in close proximity to the subject.

Conclusion of Law

As to the subject's size, the Board finds the appellant failed to submit sufficient evidence to show that the county has incorrectly listed the subject's size. The board of review included the subject's property record cards which include a diagram of the improvement's perimeter. Therefore, the Board finds the subject contains 12,447 square feet of building area and that the subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$76.48 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 appellant has not met this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the appellant's comparables #1 and #3 and the board of review's comparables. These properties sold from July 2011 to December 2012 for prices ranging from \$47.40 to \$188.98 per square foot of building area. In comparison, the appellant's assessment reflects a market value of \$76.48 per square foot which is within the range established by the comparables. Based on the record and after adjustments to the comparables, the Board finds the appellant did not demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the subject was overvalued and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not justified.

Docket No: 12-23187.001-C-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.

	Mauro Illorias
	Chairman
	R
Member	Member
	lovet 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:	May 20, 2016
	alportol
	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

Docket No: 12-23187.001-C-1

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.