

# FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Goodman Chicago Condos, LLC

DOCKET NO.: 12-28752.001-R-1 PARCEL NO.: 13-08-430-080-1023

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Goodman Chicago Condos, LLC, the appellant(s), by attorney John P. Brady, of Thomas M. Tully & Associates 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:

**LAND:** \$ 773 **IMPR.:** \$3,477 **TOTAL:** \$4,250

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 consists of a residential condominium unit. The property is located in Jefferson Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant's appeal is based on overvaluation. In support of this argument the appellant submitted evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased on May 12, 2011 for a price of \$42,500. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to 10% of the market value.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$8,880. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$88,800

Docket No: 12-28752.001-R-1

when using the 2012 level of assessments for class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance of 10%.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted an analysis estimating the market value of the subject based on the sale of one other unit within the same building. The board of review added the sale prices of the two units that sold and deducted 2% for personal property. Based on the percentage of ownership of the unit that sold, the board of review found the full value of the entire building. Multiplying the subject's percentage of ownership by the full value of the building, the board of review found the market value of the subject.

## **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 purchase of the subject property in May, 2011 for a price of \$42,500. The appellant provided evidence demonstrating the sale had the elements of an arm's length transaction. The appellant completed Section IV - Recent Sale Data of the appeal disclosing the parties to the transaction were not related, the property was sold using a Realtor, the property had been advertised on the open market with the Multiple Listing Service. In further support of the transaction, the appellant submitted a copy of the settlement statement. The Board finds the purchase price is below the market value reflected by the assessment. The Board finds the board of review did not present any evidence to challenge the arm's length nature of the transaction. Based on this record, the Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$42,500 as of January 1, 2012. Since market value has been determined the 2012 level of assessment for class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Classification Ordinance of 10% shall apply. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(c)(2).

Docket No: 12-28752.001-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.

	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:	June 24, 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: 12-28752.001-R-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.