



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

APPELLANT: Triangle District Development Corp  
DOCKET NO.: 06-25226.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 14-20-410-049-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Triangle District Development Corp, the appellant, by attorney Patrick J. Cullerton, of Thompson Coburn LLP in Chicago; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, 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: \$15,474  
IMPR: \$138,004  
TOTAL: \$153,478**

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a 3-story class 2-12 mixed-use building of masonry construction containing 8,316 square feet of building area on a slab foundation. The building is 1 year old. Features of the building include central air conditioning and a 1-car garage.

The appellant's appeal is based on unequal treatment in the assessment process. The appellant submitted information on eight comparable properties described as 2 or 3-story masonry or frame buildings that range in age from 77 to 105 years old. The comparable buildings range in size from 7,155 to 8,778 square feet of building area. Seven have partial, unfinished basements and one is on a crawl-space foundation. Two have 1½ or 2-car garages. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$4.31 to \$8.05 per square foot of building area. The subject's improvement assessment is \$16.59 per square foot of building area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's improvement assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's final assessment was disclosed. The board of review presented descriptions and assessment

information on three comparable properties consisting of 3-story class 2-12 mixed-use masonry buildings that range in age from 4 to 113 years old. The dwellings range in size from 3,276 to 8,348 square feet of building area. Two comparables feature full or partial basements, one of which is finished, and one is on a slab foundation. Two comparables have central air conditioning, one has a fireplace, and one has a 2-car garage. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from \$14.32 to \$28.95 per square foot of building area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

After reviewing the record and considering the evidence, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal. The Board further finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The appellant contends unequal treatment in the subject's improvement assessment as the basis of the appeal. Taxpayers who object to an assessment on the basis of lack of uniformity bear the burden of proving the disparity of assessment valuations by clear and convincing evidence. Kankakee County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 131 Ill.2d 1 (1989). After an analysis of the assessment data, the Board finds the appellant has not met this burden.

All eight comparables submitted by the appellant and comparable #2 submitted by the board of review were significantly older than the subject and therefore received little weight in the Board's analysis. The Board finds comparable #1 submitted by the board of review was most similar to the subject in location, size, style, exterior construction, features and age. Due to its similarity to the subject, this comparable received the most weight in the Board's analysis. This comparable's improvement assessment was \$28.95 per square foot of building area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$16.59 per square foot of building area is below this most similar comparable. After considering adjustments and the differences in both parties' comparables when compared to the subject, the Board finds the subject's improvement assessment is equitable and a reduction in the subject's 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.

*Ronald R. Guit*

Chairman

*K. L. Fern*

Member

*Frank A. Grief*

Member

*Mario M. Louie*

Member

*Shawn R. Lerski*

Member

DISSENTING: \_\_\_\_\_

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

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: March 18, 2011

*Allen Castrovillari*

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.