



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

APPELLANT: Francisco Salcido
DOCKET NO.: 12-31279.001-R-1 through 12-31279.002-R-1
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Francisco Salcido, the appellant, by attorney Stephanie Park, of Park & Longstreet, P.C. in Rolling Meadows; 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:

DOCKET NO	PARCEL NUMBER	LAND	IMPRVMT	TOTAL
12-31279.001-R-1	16-27-200-010-0000	2,878	11,510	\$14,388
12-31279.002-R-1	16-27-200-011-0000	2,808	28	\$2,836

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 two-story multi-family dwelling of masonry construction with 1,744 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1913. Features of the home include a slab foundation and a two-car garage. The property has a 5,750 square foot site and is located in Chicago, West Chicago Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-11 apartment building 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 limited evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased on March 25, 2011 for a price of \$53,200. The appellant's evidence of the subject's sale included a copy of the settlement statement and an affidavit from the appellant. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's total assessment to \$8,156.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal". The board of review's final decision disclosed a total assessment for the subject of \$17,224. The subject's total assessment reflects a market value of \$172,240 or \$98.76 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the level of assessments for class 2 property of 10% 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 comparable sales.

The appellant submitted a rebuttal brief critiquing the board of review's submission and requesting the appeal be written on the evidence in the record.

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 did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value in the record to be the board of review's comparable sales #3 and #4. These comparables were similar to the subject in location, age and most features. These properties also sold proximate in time to the assessment date at issue. The comparables sold for a prices of \$159,400 and \$180,000 or \$72.19 and \$79.19 per square foot of living area land included, respectively. The subject's total assessment reflects a market value of \$172,240 or \$98.76 per square foot of living area, including land. The Board finds the subject's assessment is supported by the best comparable sales in this record on a total market value basis and is slightly above the market values on a per square foot basis. However, accepted real estate valuation theory provides, all other factors being equal, as the size of a property increases, its per unit value decreases. Likewise, as the size of a property decreases, its per unit value increases. Based on this analysis, the Board finds the subject's higher per square foot estimated market value is well justified given its smaller size. The Board gave little weight to the subject's sale due to the lack of information as to the length of time the property was exposed on the open market. The appellant partially completed Section IV - Recent Sale Data of the appeal disclosing the parties to the transaction were not related and the property had been advertised on the open market with the Multiple Listing Service (MLS), however, the appellant entered "unknown" as to the length of time the subject was marketed. The appellant submitted a copy of the settlement statement and an affidavit from the appellant, however, neither of these documents discloses the length of market exposure, which is an important element of determining whether an arm's length transaction occurred. Furthermore, there is a conflict with information on Section IV-Recent Sale Data and the affidavit with respect to whether the property sold out of foreclosure. Also, the settlement statement references one Property Index Number (PIN) while two PIN's are under appeal. The Property Tax Appeal Board's appeal form requires Section IV be completed when arguing overvaluation based on a recent sale. The Board gave less weight to the board of review's remaining comparable sales due to their sale dates occurring less proximate in time to

Docket No: 12-31279.001-R-1 through 12-31279.002-R-1

the assessment date at issue. Based on this record the Board finds the subject's assessment is reflective of market value and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not 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.

Mario Albino

Chairman

K. L. Fan

Member

JR

Member

Robert J. Steffen

Member

Dane DeKinis

Acting Member

DISSENTING: _____

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: December 23, 2016

A. Proctor

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 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.