



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

APPELLANT: John Vlahakis
DOCKET NO.: 06-25782.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 05-20-122-006-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are John Vlahakis, the appellant, by attorney Jason T. Shilson, of O'Keefe Lyons & Hynes, LLC 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: \$ 18,053
IMPR.: \$ 104,832
TOTAL: \$ 122,885

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of an 8,850 square foot parcel improved with a six-year-old, two-story, single-family dwelling of frame construction located in New Trier Township, Cook County. Features of the residence include three and one-half bathrooms, a full-finished basement, central air-conditioning, a fireplace and a two-car detached garage. The appellant's petition suggests the subject dwelling contains 3,190 square feet of living area, while the board of review's documents indicate the subject contains 3,719 square feet. In support of this claim, the appellant submitted a detailed building sketch for the subject dwelling. In addition, the appellant's attorney submitted a two-page brief disclosing the first floor contains 1,557 square feet and the second floor contains 1,633 square feet for a total living area of 3,190 square feet for the subject.

The appellant, through counsel, submitted evidence before the Property Tax Appeal Board arguing unequal treatment in the assessment process of the improvement as the basis of the appeal. In support of this claim, the appellant submitted assessment data

and descriptive information on four properties suggested as comparable to the subject. Based on the appellant's documents, the four suggested comparables consist of two-story, single-family dwellings of masonry or frame and masonry construction located on the same street and within two blocks of the subject. The improvements range in size from 2,176 to 2,890 square feet of living area and range in age from 53 to 58 years old. The comparables contain one and one-half or two and one-half bathrooms, a full-finished basement, central air-conditioning, one or two fireplaces and a one-car or two-car attached garage. The improvement assessments range from \$19.34 to \$22.03 per square foot of living 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" disclosing the subject's total assessment of \$122,885. In support of the assessment the board submitted property characteristic printouts and descriptive data on four properties suggested as comparable to the subject. The suggested comparables are improved with two-story, single-family dwellings of frame or masonry construction with the same neighborhood code as the subject. The improvements range in size from 2,184 to 3,732 square feet of living area and range in age from one to four years old. The comparables contain from two and one-half to four full bathrooms, a finished or unfinished basement, central air-conditioning, from one to three fireplaces and a two-car garage. The improvement assessments range from \$29.06 to \$48.26 per square foot of living area. Based on the evidence presented, 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 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 Board finds the appellant has not overcome this burden.

The first issue before the Board is the correct square footage attributable to the subject improvement. The Board finds that the appellant substantiated the claim that the subject's square footage is different than the public record presented by the board of review. The Board finds the appellant's detailed building sketch persuasive. Consequently, the Board finds the subject contains 3,190 square feet of living area. The subject's improvement assessment is \$104,832 or \$32.86 per square foot of living area, based on 3,190 square feet.

Next, the Board finds the board of review's comparables one, two and three to be the most similar properties to the subject in the record. These three properties are similar to the subject in size, amenities, age, design and location and have improvement assessments ranging from \$29.06 to \$48.26 per square foot of living area. The subject's per square foot improvement assessment of \$32.86, based on 3,190 square feet, falls within the range established by these properties. The Board finds the board of review's one remaining comparable differs significantly from the subject in size and accorded less weight. The Board also finds two of the appellant's comparables differ significantly from the subject in size. The Board further finds the appellant's four comparables vastly inferior to the subject in age and accorded less weight. After considering adjustments and the differences in both parties' suggested comparables when compared to the subject, the Board finds the subject's per square foot improvement assessment is supported by the most similar properties contained in the record.

As a result of this analysis, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds the appellant has failed to adequately demonstrate that the subject dwelling was inequitably assessed by clear and convincing evidence 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

K. L. Fern

Member

Frank A. Huff

Member

Mario Morris

Member

Shawn R. Lerbis

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: May 20, 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.