



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

APPELLANT: Annette Ramos Erkan
DOCKET NO.: 15-30419.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 30-30-414-032-1009

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Annette Ramos Erkan, the appellant(s), by attorney Jessica Hill-Magiera, Attorney at Law in Lake Zurich; 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: \$504
IMPR.: \$3,544
TOTAL: \$4,048

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 2015 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 is a residential condominium unit contained in a 38 year-old, three-story, 12 unit residential condominium building of masonry construction. The units own from 8.33% to 8.34% of the common elements. The subject owned 8.334% of the common elements. The property has an 18,637 square foot site in Thornton Township, Cook County. The evidence did not disclose whether the subject was owner-occupied in the lien year. It is a Class 2-99 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 information on four suggested comparable sales and adjustment information in a grid entitled, "Property Equalization Values." The only key property characteristics the appellant disclosed about these comparable properties were the address, proximity and description of the type of buildings containing those properties. One of the sales comparables

was for a unit in the subject's building. The sales occurred from 2014 through 2015. The appellant requested a total assessment reduction to \$1,827.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$4,048. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$40,480 when applying the 2015 level of assessment of 10.00% for Class 2 property 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 one suggested sale comparable. The board of review disclosed this sale occurred in 2006 for a unit in the subject's building. This sale was for a unit owning the same common elements ownership as the subject. However, the board of review did not disclose information on key property characteristics of this comparable property.

In rebuttal, the appellant argued that the comparables submitted as evidence by the board of review should be given diminished weight because they were dissimilar to the subject in various key property characteristics. The appellant also objected to the inclusion in the board of review's evidence a copy of the Order to Cease and Desist against Rick Robin. The appellant reaffirmed the request for an assessment reduction.

At hearing, the board of review objected that the appellant's "Property Equalization Values" grid was inadmissible hearsay evidence without the person who prepared that grid present at hearing and subject to cross-examination under oath. The Board denied the board of review's request to dismiss the appeal, but the Board sustained the hearsay objection. The Board held that it may consider the appellant's raw, unadjusted sale data. The appellant reiterated the argument that appellant's sale comparables were the best evidence of the subject's market value.

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 appellant failed to submit sufficient key property characteristics for three or more comparable properties for the Board to make meaningful comparisons to the subject. Proof of market value should include "documentation of the similarity, proximity and lack of distinguishing characteristics of the sales comparables to the subject property." 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(c)(4). The appellant's submission of only the address, proximity and general building description is not sufficient. As for the board of review's one sale comparable, it was not a recent sale and is, therefore, of no weight. Based on this evidence, the Board finds that the appellant has failed to show by a preponderance of the evidence that the subject is overvalued. Therefore, 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. Pursuant to Section 1910.50(d) of the rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(d)) the proceeding before the Property Tax Appeal Board is terminated when the decision is rendered. The Property Tax Appeal Board does not require any motion or request for reconsideration.



Chairman



Member



Member



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 17, 2018



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 or years of the same general assessment period, as provided in Sections 9-125 through 9-225, 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 such subsequent year or years 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 OR YEARS. A separate petition and evidence must be filed for each of the remaining years of the general assessment period.

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.

PARTIES OF RECORD

AGENCY

State of Illinois
Property Tax Appeal Board
William G. Stratton Building, Room 402
401 South Spring Street
Springfield, IL 62706-4001

APPELLANT

Annette Ramos Erkan, by attorney:
Jessica Hill-Magiera
Attorney at Law
790 Harvest Drive
Lake Zurich, IL 60047

COUNTY

Cook County Board of Review
County Building, Room 601
118 North Clark Street
Chicago, IL 60602