



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

APPELLANT: Ravi Amblee
DOCKET NO.: 14-24234.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 18-30-306-054-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Ravi Amblee, the appellant(s), by attorney Brian S. Maher, of Weis, DuBrock, Doody & Maher 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 **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: \$16,591
IMPR.: \$78,909
TOTAL: \$95,500

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 2013 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 28,855 square foot parcel of land improved with an approximately 25-year old, two-story, masonry, single-family dwelling. The property is located in Lyons Township, Cook County and is a class 2 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 an appraisal estimating the subject property had a market value of \$755,000 as of January 1, 2014. The appraisal discloses that the subject sold in May 2012 for \$955,000 with no further explanation. The appraiser does not explain if the sale was given any consideration. The appraisal lists the subject's size as 5,825 square feet of building area and was inspected on May 15, 2014. The appellant requests an assessment based on 10% of the appraised value.

The appraisal undertook the sales comparison approach to value. The appraiser analyzed four sales comparables that sold from March 2011 to July 2013 for prices ranging from \$143.57 to \$218.95 per square foot of building area. After making adjustments for various factors including condition of the properties, the appraiser estimated the subject's value under this approach at \$800,000. The appraiser then adjusted this value to account for the cost to cure the deferred maintenance items or building components that require repair, replacement, or rehabilitation for a final value of \$755,000, rounded.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$95,500. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$955,000 using the Cook County Real Estate Classification Ordinance level of assessment for class 2 property of 10%. The board of review lists the subject as containing 5,350 square feet of building area with no further explanation.

In support of the assessment the board of review submitted three sales comparables. These properties sold from March 2012 to September 2012 for prices ranging from \$143.57 to \$277.92 per square foot of building area.

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 thoroughly considered the parties' evidence. The Board gives diminished weight to the appraisal because it lacks data to further explain why the subject's sale was not given any weight in establishing the subject's market value. The appraisal failed to offer any explanation of the sale or to disclose what level of consideration was given to the sale.

In addition, the appraiser made adjustments to the sales comparables for the condition of properties compared to the subject. Then the appraiser made an addition adjustment to the final value for the cost to cure many of the items that would be considered in adjusting the property due to the condition of those items. The appraiser failed to fully explain how these two adjustments are distinct from each other. For these reasons, the Board gives the adjustments and the conclusion of value within the appraisal no weight.

The Board does give weight to the appraisal in regards to the subject's improvement size. The Board finds the appraiser preformed a site visit while the board of review failed to submit any evidence to support the subject's size. Therefore, the Board finds the subject contains 5,825 square feet of building area.

The courts have stated that where there is credible evidence of comparable sales, these sales are to be given significant weight as evidence of market value. Chrysler Corp. v. Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board, 69 Ill.App.3d 207 (2nd Dist. 1979); Willow Hill Grain, Inc. v. Property Tax

Appeal Board, 187 Ill.App.3d 9 (5th Dist. 1989). Therefore, the Board will consider the raw sales data from both parties along with the subject's sale information.

The parties submitted seven sale comparables along with the subject's 2012 sale information. The Board finds the appellant's comparables #1, #3, and #4 and the board of review's sale comparables #2 and #3 similar to the subject and most probative in determining the subject's market value as of the lien date. These sales occurred from March 2012 to July 2013 for prices ranging from \$143.57 to \$277.92 per square foot of building area. The subject's current assessment reflects a market value of \$163.95 per square foot of building area. In considering the subject's sale and the making adjustments to the comparables for pertinent factors, the Board finds the subject's current assessment is supported by the market and a reduction in the assessment is not warranted.

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



Member



Member



Acting Member

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: _____

April 21, 2017



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.