



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

APPELLANT: Mark Tormey  
DOCKET NO.: 06-28664.001-R-2 through 06-28664.003-R-2  
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Mark Tormey, the appellant, by attorney James E. Doherty of Thomas M. Tully & Associates in Chicago; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, 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:

DOCKET NO	PARCEL NUMBER	LAND	IMPRVMT	TOTAL
06-28664.001-R-2	14-33-108-031-0000	19,680	71,291	\$90,971
06-28664.002-R-2	14-33-108-032-0000	19,680	81,937	\$101,617
06-28664.003-R-2	14-33-108-033-0000	19,680	102,180	\$121,860

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a three-story, single-family dwelling of masonry construction. The building is seven years old and contains 5,321 square feet of living area. Features include a full finished basement, central air conditioning, four fireplaces, and a four-car detached garage. The subject is located in Chicago, North Chicago Township, Cook County.

The appellant contends the assessment of the subject property is inequitable. In support of this argument the appellant submitted descriptions and assessment information on six comparables that have the same assigned classification and neighborhood codes as the subject. The comparables range in age from four to fifteen years old and in size from 5,100 to 6,748 square feet of living area. Two comparables have full unfinished basements, and four have finished basements, either full or partial. Each comparable has central air conditioning and one to three fireplaces, and five comparables have a garage. The data provided by the

appellant indicated the comparables had improvement assessments ranging from \$43.97 to \$50.40 per square foot of building area. The appellant submitted a copy of the decision issued by the board of review establishing a total assessment of \$465,496. The appellant also indicated the subject had an improvement assessment of \$406,456 or \$76.39 per square foot of building area. Based on this evidence the appellant requested the subject's assessment be reduced.

The board of review did not submit its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" or any evidence in support of its assessed valuation of the subject property. The board of review did notify taxing districts on January 4, 2008 that the classification for this appeal was changed from R-1 to R-2.

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 the evidence in the record supports a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The appellant contends assessment inequity 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 assessments 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 a reduction is warranted.

The appellant in this appeal submitted assessment information on six assessment comparables to demonstrate the subject was inequitably assessed. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$43.97 to \$50.40 per square foot. The subject has an improvement assessment of \$76.39 per square foot, which is above the range established by the comparables. The board of review did not submit any evidence in support of its assessment of the subject property or to refute the appellant's argument as required by section 1910.40(a) of the rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board and is found to be in default pursuant to section 1910.69(a) of the rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board. Based on this record the Property Tax Appeal Board finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is 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. Grief*

Member

Member

*Shawn R. Lerski*

Member

Member

*Mario M. Louie*

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.