



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

APPELLANT: MRR 2102 N. Damen, LLC
DOCKET NO.: 21-33208.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 14-31-131-027-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are MRR 2102 N. Damen, LLC, the appellant, by David R. Bass, attorney-at-law of Field and Goldberg, LLC 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 **A Reduction** 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: \$16,800
IMPR.: \$52,200
TOTAL: \$69,000

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 2021 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 improved with a four-story, six-unit, multi-family building of brick exterior construction that contains 5,337 square feet of building area. The building was constructed in 1890 and is approximately 131 years old. Features of the property include a basement and central air conditioning. The property has a 2,400 square foot site located in Chicago, West Chicago Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-11 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 \$690,000 as of January 1, 2021. The appraisal was prepared by John S. O'Dwyer, an Illinois Certified General Real Estate Appraiser, and Nicholas Hilla, an Illinois Certified General Real Estate Appraiser, of JSO Valuation Group, Ltd. The fee simple property rights were appraised. The

intended use of the appraisal is as an aid in establishing the correct assessed valuation for ad valorem taxation purposes. The appraisers determined the highest and best use of the property as vacant would be to develop the site with a mixed-use improvement. The appraisers determined the highest and best use of the property as improved would be the current improved use.

The appraisers described the subject as being improved with a four-story building of brick exterior construction containing 5,337 square feet of gross building area with 6 apartment units. The building was constructed in 1890. The appraisers further described the improvements as being in average condition, however, they indicated there is a significant amount of functional obsolescence and deferred maintenance in the building. The subject has a full basement with a portion of the basement being the lower level of the first floor three-bedroom apartment. The remainder of the basement is unfinished and houses the electrical metering, HVAC system and miscellaneous maintenance item storage. The appraisers also explained that the full basement is subject to flooding. The property has a unit mix of three 1-bedroom units, one 2-bedroom unit, and two 3-bedroom units. The ceiling heights of the units is eight feet with the basement having a ceiling height of seven feet. The appraisers also indicated the subject has two surface parking spaces along the rear elevation of the property that are accessible from the rear alleyway.

The appraisers explained the basement experiences flooding which makes the first floor three-bedroom unit difficult to lease. They also asserted the fourth floor three-bedroom unit is difficult to access as there is no elevator within the subject, and the unit has no exterior access but relies on a narrow internal stairwell to move in and out, making the unit difficult to lease. The appraisers also contend the subject has only two on-site parking spaces which is inadequate for an apartment building with six units. Additionally, the appraisers explained the subject's main entrance along the south elevation of the building is located in a narrow passageway that is approximately three feet wide making moving any kind of bulky items like furniture and appliances almost impossible using the main entrance. In estimating the market value of the subject property the appraisers developed the income approach to value and the sales comparison approach to value.

The appraisers' first step in developing the income approach to value was to estimate the market rent of the subject property. The appraisers identified four rental comparables composed of 3-story buildings that range in size from 4,641 to 9,000 square feet of building area and have from 5 to 8 units. The buildings were constructed from 1888 to 1896. The comparables have unit mixes of 1-bedroom, 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom apartments. The monthly rental rates per unit ranged from \$1,406 to \$2,030 per unit for one bed-units, \$1,755 to \$2,257 per unit for two-bedroom units, and \$2,377 to \$2,863 per unit for three-bedroom units. The appraisers also indicated the subject's rent roll as of January 1, 2021, was as follows:

Unit Type	Monthly Rent	Annual Rent
1 Bed / 1 Bath	\$1,675	\$20,100
1 Bed / 1 Bath	\$1,400	\$16,800
1 Bed / 1 Bath	\$1,695	\$20,340
2 Bed / 2 Bath	\$1,995	\$23,940
3 Bed / 2 Bath	\$2,250	\$27,000
3 Bed / 2 Bath	\$1,795	\$21,540

Totals	\$10,810	\$129,720
--------	----------	-----------

The appraisers decided to use the contract rents for the stabilized analysis. They explained the subject's one and two-bedroom units are in line with the market rent, and they reflect what a landlord in this marketplace can expect. The appraisers also contend the three-bedroom units are difficult to market as one unit experiences flooding, and the other unit is on the fourth floor and lacks any exterior entrance. The appraisers determined the subject had a base rental income of \$129,720. The appraisers also estimated the subject would have \$2,500 in other income resulting in a potential gross income (PGI) of \$132,200. The appraisers next estimated the subject would suffer from a vacancy loss of 5% of PGI or \$6,611 resulting in an income of \$125,609. The appraisers next determined the subject would suffer from a collection loss of 1.5% or \$1,884 to arrive at an effective gross income (EGI) of \$123,725.

The appraisers next estimated the expenses to be deducted from the EGI using the subject's historical income and expenses as well as industry standards. The stabilized expenses are as follows:

- Insurance - \$2,000 per annum or 1.62% of effective gross income.
- Legal & Professional fees - \$1,500 per year.
- Management - \$6,186 or 5.00% of effective gross income.
- General & Administration - \$2,474 or 2.00% of the effective gross income.
- Commissions - \$1,237 or 1.00% of the effective gross income.
- Landscaping & Snow - \$1,500 per year.
- Fire/Life Safety - \$750 per year.
- Move - in/Move out - \$2,474 or 2.00% of the effective gross income.
- Cleaning/Janitor - \$5,000 per year.
- Utilities - \$2,000 per year.
- Repairs - \$16,750 per year, or 13.54% of effective gross income.
- Other Expenses - \$1,500 per year.
- Reserves - \$2,474 or 2.00% of the effective gross income.

The appraisers estimated the total stabilized expenses to be \$45,847. Deducting the total expenses from the EGI resulted in a net operating income (NOI) of \$77,878.

The appraisers next determined the capitalization rate to be used to capitalize the NOI into an estimate of value. Using investor surveys for apartments the appraisers reported rates ranging from 3.92% to 12.65% and from 4.00% to 6.75%. The appraisers indicated the band on investment technique provided a capitalization rate range of 5.87% to 8.51%. The appraisers identified four capitalization rate comparables within the report that had rates ranging from 7.00% to 9.00%. Based on this data the appraisers estimated a capitalization rate of 8.50% for the subject property. Due to the real estate taxes not being expensed, the appraisers next estimated the effective tax rate or tax load factor to be 2.30% which was added to the capitalization rate to arrive at a loaded capitalization rate of 10.80%. Dividing the NOI of \$77,878 by the loaded capitalization rate of 10.80% resulted in a capitalized value of \$721,093, which was rounded to an estimated value under the income approach of \$720,000.

The appraisers next estimated the subject's value using the sales comparison approach to value using four comparable sales. The comparables were composed of multi-family buildings that range in size from 2,322 to 5,625 square feet of building area and have either 3 or 6 units. Three comparables have two spaces of surface parking and one comparable has two spaces of parking in a structure. The buildings were built from 1880 to 1996. Each comparable is located in Chicago with sites ranging in size from 1,635 to 3,842 square feet of land area. These properties sold from April 2019 to May 2020 for prices ranging from \$401,000 to \$850,000 or from \$151.11 to \$243.32 per square foot of building area or from \$94,167 to \$141,667 per unit, including land. The appraisers determined no transactional adjustments to the comparables were needed for such items as property rights conveyed, financing terms, conditions of sale, expenditures after the sale or market conditions. The appraisers next determined if the comparables needed any adjustments for location, age, condition, land to building ratio, amenities, size, economic characteristics, legal characteristics and non-realty components to value. The appraisers made downward adjustments to comparable #1 for age, condition, and size. No other adjustments to the comparables were made. Based on this information the appraisers estimated the subject property had a market value of \$110,000 per unit, land included, for a total indicated value under the sales comparison approach of \$660,000.

In reconciling the two approaches to value the appraisers gave primary emphasis to the income approach to value and secondary consideration to the sales comparison approach to value to arrive at an estimated market value of \$690,000 as of January 1, 2020. Accordingly, the appellant requested the subject's total assessment be reduced to \$69,000 to reflect the appraised value.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$142,220. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$1,422,200 or \$266.47 per square foot of building area or \$237,033 per unit, including land, when applying the level of assessment for class 2-11 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance of 10%.

The board of review described the subject property as being improved with a three-story building with a full basement with a formal recreation room, central air conditioning, and a two-car garage. The board of review submitted a copy of a photograph of the subject building but provided no other documentation to support of its description of the subject property. In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales composed of class 2-11 properties that are improved with 1.5-story or 2-story multi-family buildings of masonry exterior construction that range in size from 2,022 to 3,581 square feet of building area. The buildings range in age from 101 to 139 years old. Three comparables have full basements with an apartment or recreation room and one comparable has a slab foundation. One comparable has central air conditioning and three comparables each have a 2-car garage. The comparables have 2, 3 or 4 bathrooms. These properties each have a site with 2,400 square feet of building area. These properties have the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject property and are located ¼ of a mile from the subject. The comparables sold from July 2021 to December 2021 for prices ranging from \$829,000 to \$1,250,000 or from \$309.35 to \$502.46 per square foot of building area, including land.

In rebuttal the appellant's counsel argued the board of review did not comply with Property Tax Appeal Board rule 1910.65(c)(4) (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(c)(4)) in that it did not provide documentation of the similarity, proximity, and lack of distinguishing characteristics of the comparables to the subject property. Counsel contends the board of review did not provide any independent documentation which verified the correctness of the property information. Additionally, counsel argued that pursuant to Property Tax Appeal Board rule 1910.63(c) (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(c)) once the appellant has met its burden of going forward the board of review must provide substantive, documentary evidence or legal argument sufficient to support its assessment of the subject property. Counsel contends the board of review did not provide any substantive documentary evidence as the grid sheet and photographs provided by the board of review is not substantive evidence as contemplated by the Property Tax Appeal Board. Based on these omissions, the appellant's counsel argued the Property Tax Appeal Board should give little or no weight to the board of review submission.

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 appraisal submitted by the appellant estimating the subject property had a market value of \$690,000 as of January 1, 2021. The appellant's appraisers developed the income capitalization approach to value and the sales comparison approach to value. The appraisers provided a detailed description of the subject property, including their opinion of the negative aspects of the first floor and fourth floor apartment units, which was superior to the description of the subject property presented by the board of review. The report also contained an in depth discussion of the two approaches to value and the appraisers' rationale for selecting various components such as market rent, vacancy and collection losses, expenses, the capitalization rate used to capitalize the net operating income into an indication of value, a discussion of the comparable sales, the adjustments to the comparables sales to make them equivalent to the subject property, and the reasons for selecting a unit of value of \$110,000 per apartment. The board of review presented no evidence to challenge, rebut or refute any of the calculations or assumptions used by the appraisers in arriving at their estimated value for the subject property.

The board of review submitted raw sales data on four comparable sales that were not particularly similar to the subject in building size. Additionally, the board of review did not disclose to this Board the number of apartment units each of the comparables had, which would have been beneficial in developing a unit of comparison for the subject property. Furthermore, the board of review did not provide any analysis or adjustments to its comparables to account for differences from the subject property.

In conclusion, the Board finds the narrative appraisal submitted by the appellant is more credible than the raw sales presented by the board of review in establishing the market value of the

subject property as of the assessment date at issue. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$1,422,200 which is above the appraised value of \$690,000. Based on this record the Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$690,000 as of the assessment date at issue and a reduction in the subject's assessment commensurate with the appellant's request is appropriate.

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: _____

November 25, 2025



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

MRR 2102 N. Damen, LLC, by attorney:
David R. Bass
Field and Goldberg, LLC
10 South LaSalle Street
Suite 2910
Chicago, IL 60603

COUNTY

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