



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

APPELLANT: Nancy Hill  
DOCKET NO.: 06-25665.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 14-20-311-038-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Nancy Hill, 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, 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:** \$ 4,126  
**IMPR.:** \$ 38,873  
**TOTAL:** \$ 42,999

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property consists of a 603 square foot parcel improved with a 13-year-old, three-story, town house dwelling of masonry construction containing 1,445 square feet of living area and located in Lake View Township, Cook County. Features of the residence include two full bathrooms, central air-conditioning and a one and one-half car attached garage.

The parties jointly agreed to consolidate this appeal with nine other matters for hearing purposes. All the residential appeals raise the same issue with varying suggested comparables. The appellant's contention is unequal treatment in the assessment process. However, counsel raised a legal issue arguing that the PTAB as a matter of law cannot rely on the board of review's comparables, because they are: identical to the subject in most respects, contain nearly the same assessments, and have filed similar property tax appeals. Counsel argued that the Second District Appellant Court ruled that PTAB erred as a matter of law in relying on such properties. Pace Realty Group, Inc. v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 306 Ill.App.3d 718, 728 N.E.2d 1249

(2<sup>nd</sup> Dist. 1999). Counsel also argued that the present matter is identical to Pace Realty in that the Cook County Board of Review is relying upon town houses identical to the subject property to establish the high end of the range of assessments to suggest the subject property's assessment is uniform. Counsel further argued that the PTAB cannot consider these properties for the same reasons the Appellate Court cited in Pace Realty. First, the assessments of the other identical town houses merely self-validate the very same assessments under appeal. Second, the use of other identical town houses makes the assessment appeal process meaningless because it in essence unlawfully takes away the constitutional right of a town house owner to make a uniformity appeal if one or more of the other identical town houses could be used to establish the high end of the range. Therefore, counsel argued that pursuant to Pace Realty, the PTAB cannot rely upon similar situated comparables whose assessment is being currently contested and under appeal.

In support of the equity claim, the appellant submitted assessment data and descriptive information on eight properties suggested as comparable to the subject. Based on the appellant's documents, the eight suggested comparables consist of three-story, town house dwellings of masonry construction located within the subject's neighborhood. The improvements range in size from 1,508 to 1,658 square feet of living area and range in age from 11 to 14 years old. The comparables contain two or two and one-half bathrooms and central air-conditioning. Two comparables have fireplaces and three comparables contain a one-car or two-car attached garage. The improvement assessments range from \$23.82 to \$24.86 per square foot of living area.

The appellant also argued that the subject's market value is not accurately reflected in its assessment. In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted five properties suggested as comparable to the subject. The five comparables consist of two-story or three-story, 13-year-old, town house dwellings of masonry construction located within the same Sidwell block as the subject. The improvements range in size from 1,275 to 1,743 square feet of living area. They sold from April 2003 to January 2006 for prices ranging from \$385,000 to \$470,000, or \$240.68 to \$316.86 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on the evidence submitted, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's improvement assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the subject's total assessment of \$42,999. The subject's assessment reflects a fair market value of \$424,891 or \$294.04 per square foot of living area, including land, when applying the 2006 three-year median level of assessments of 10.12% for Cook County class 2 properties as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue. The subject's improvement assessment is \$38,873 or \$26.90 per square foot of living area. In support of the assessment, the board submitted property characteristic printouts and descriptive data on three properties suggested as comparable to the subject. The suggested comparables

consist of three-story, 13-year-old, 1,445 or 1,498 square foot town house dwellings of masonry construction with the same neighborhood code as the subject. The comparables contain two or two and one-half bathrooms, central air-conditioning and a one and one-half car attached garage. The improvement assessments range from \$26.90 to \$26.93 per square foot of living area.

At hearing, the board's representative indicated that the appellant has the burden of proving the disparity of assessment valuation by clear and convincing evidence. Based on the evidence presented, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

After hearing the testimony 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 appellant's argument was unequal treatment in the assessment process. The Illinois Supreme Court has held that 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). The evidence must demonstrate a consistent pattern of assessment inequities within the assessment jurisdiction. After an analysis of the assessment data, the PTAB finds the appellant has not overcome this burden.

Pursuant to Pace Realty Group, Inc., v. The Property Tax Appeals Board, 306 Ill. App. 3d 718, 728, 713 N.E.2d 1249, 239 Ill. Dec. 399 (1999), the Appellate Court found that in determining what properties are truly comparable, there is error as a matter of law when the selection of a comparable includes a property which has also received the same contested assessment. Further, the Court stated that conducting a uniformity analysis in such a manner will lead to absurd results and will render the assessment appeal process meaningless. Therefore, the Board shall accord no weight to suggested comparables which are: sited within the subject's complex, also under appeal, and reflect a similarly contested assessment. Thereby, the board of review's comparable two will be accorded no weight in this case's analysis as a matter of law.

The PTAB finds the appellant's comparables one, five, six, seven and eight and the board of reviews comparables one and three to be the most similar properties to the subject in the record. These seven properties are similar to the subject in improvement size, amenities, age, design and location and have improvement assessments ranging from \$24.85 to \$26.93 per square foot of living area. The subject's per square foot improvement assessment of \$26.90 falls within the range established by these properties. The board finds the appellant's remaining comparables less similar to the subject in size and accorded less weight. After considering adjustments and the differences in both parties' suggested comparables when compared to the subject, the PTAB finds the subject's per square foot improvement assessment is supported by the most similar properties contained in the record.

When market value is the basis of the appeal the value of the property must be proved by a preponderance of the evidence. National City Bank of Michigan/Illinois v. Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board, 331 Ill.App.3d 1038 (3<sup>rd</sup> Dist, 2002); Winnebago County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 313 Ill.App.3d 179 (2<sup>nd</sup> Dist. 2000). Proof of market value may consist of an appraisal, a recent arms-length sale of the subject property, recent sales of comparable properties, or recent construction costs of the subject property. (86 Ill.Adm.Code §1910.65(c)) Having reviewed the record and considering the evidence, the PTAB finds the appellant has not met this burden.

Regarding the appellant's overvaluation argument, the PTAB finds the appellant submitted five properties that sold from April 2003 to January 2006 for prices ranging from \$385,000 to \$470,000, or \$240.68 to \$316.86 per square foot of living area, including land. In comparison, the subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$294.04 per square foot of living area, including land, which falls within the range established by the appellant's comparables.

As a result of this analysis, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds the appellant has failed to adequately demonstrate that the subject was inequitably assessed or overvalued and a reduction 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. Cuit*

Chairman

*Frank J. Huff*

Member

Member

*Mario M. Louie*

*William R. Lerbis*

Member

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: September 23, 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.