



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

APPELLANT: Will Horton  
DOCKET NO.: 07-21694.001-R-1 through 07-21694.003-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Will Horton, the appellant(s), by attorney Donald L. Schramm, of Rieff Schramm Kanter & Guttman 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
07-21694.001-R-1	25-06-115-008-0000	11,870	835	\$ 12,705
07-21694.002-R-1	25-06-115-009-0000	3,569	8,201	\$ 11,770
07-21694.003-R-1	25-06-115-010-0000	3,569	32,803	\$ 36,372

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property has 3,570 square feet of land, which is improved with a 56 year old, two-story, masonry, apartment building containing 6,166 square feet of living area. The subject includes three and two one-half baths, air conditioning, and a slab. The subject is located in Lake Township, Cook County. The appellant's appeal is based on unequal treatment in the assessment process.

In support of the equity argument, the appellant, via counsel, submitted descriptive and assessment information on six properties suggested as comparable to the subject. These properties are described as two-story or three-story, masonry, apartment buildings that are from 39 to 113 years old, and contain from 1,800 to 5,919 square feet of living area. Additionally, the suggested comparables have from one to three baths, two of the properties have a garage, ranging from a one and one-half-car to a four-car garage, and all of the properties have a partial unfinished basement. These suggested comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$3.85 to \$6.69 per square foot of living area.

The appellant's comparables address the property index numbers ("PINs") ending in -009 and -010 only. These properties are prorated, where PIN -009 contains 20% of the improvement, and PIN -010 contains 80%. The appellant did not submit any evidence to challenge PIN -008's assessment. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The Cook County Board of Review submitted its "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's final assessment of \$61,478 was disclosed. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review presented descriptive and assessment information on four properties suggested as comparable to the subject. These properties are described as two-story or one and one-half-story, masonry, apartment buildings that are from 32 to 77 years old, and contain from 2,430 to 3,757 square feet of living area. Additionally, the suggested comparables have from two to four and one-half baths, one of the properties has a fireplace, two of the properties have air conditioning, two of the properties have a two-car garage, and either a full unfinished basement, a partial unfinished basement, or a slab. These suggested comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$8.93 to \$9.37 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment is \$8.81 per square foot of living area. The board of review's evidence confirms the 20%-80% proration factor for PINs -009 and -010. 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 (the "Board") finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal.

The appellant contends unequal treatment in the subject's improvement assessment as the basis of this 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. Walsh v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 181 Ill. 2d 228, 234 (1998) (citing Kankakee Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 131 Ill. 2d 1 (1989)); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.63(e). To succeed in an appeal based on lack of uniformity, the appellant must submit documentation "showing the similarity, proximity and lack of distinguishing characteristics of the assessment comparables to the subject property." Cook Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 403 Ill. App. 3d 139, 145 (1st Dist. 2010); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.65(b). "[T]he critical consideration is not the number of allegedly similar properties, but whether they are in fact 'comparable' to the subject property." Cook Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 403 Ill. App. 3d at 145 (citing DuPage Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 284 Ill. App. 3d 649, 645-55 (2d Dist. 1996)). After an analysis of the assessment data, the Board finds that the appellant has met this burden.

The Board finds that Comparables #1, #2, and #6 submitted by the appellant were most similar to the subject in location, size, style, exterior construction, features, and/or age. Due to their similarities to the subject, these comparables received the most weight in the Board's analysis. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$3.85 to \$6.69 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$8.81 per square foot of living area is above the range established by the most similar comparables. Therefore, after considering adjustments and differences in both parties' comparables when compared to the subject, the Board finds that the subject's improvement assessment is not equitable, and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted. The reduction shall conform to the proration factor acknowledged by both parties. Additionally, since the appellant did not provide any evidence to contest PIN -008's assessment, the Board will not change that PINs assessment.

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.

*Donald R. Cuit*

Chairman

*Frank J. Huff*

Member

*Mark Morris*

Member

*J.R.*

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: March 22, 2013

*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.