FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION
ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Anthony Novak
DOCKET NO.: 07-21798.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 27-14-207-011-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Anthony Novak, the appellant(s), by attorney Rusty A. Payton, of Law Offices of Rusty A. Payton, P.C. of 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:	$ 7,663
IMPR.:	$ 19,676
TOTAL:	$ 27,339

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property is improved with a multi-level dwelling of frame and masonry construction containing 1148 square feet of living area. The dwelling is 30 years old. Features of the home include a partial, finished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a two-car garage.

The appellant's appeal is based on unequal treatment in the assessment process. The appellant submitted basic assessment information on seven properties but provided sufficiently detailed property characteristics information on only four comparable properties. They were described as multi-level frame and masonry dwellings that range in age from 23 to 30 years old. The comparable dwellings range in size from 1380 to 1424 square feet of living area. Three have partial basements, three have fireplaces, and two have central air conditioning. The appellant did not include any data concerning garages for the comparables. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from $12.23 to $12.88 per square foot of living area.

The subject's improvement assessment is $17.14 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" wherein the subject's final assessment was disclosed. The board of review presented descriptions and assessment information on four comparable properties consisting of multi-level frame and masonry dwellings that range in age from 25 to 31 years old. The dwellings have 1144 or 1148 square feet of living area. Features include partial, finished basements, central air conditioning, fireplaces and two-car garages. Two are in deluxe condition. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from $$17.23 to $18.17 per square foot of living 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.

The Board finds the comparables submitted by both parties were similar to the subject in most property characteristics. The board of review's comparables #3 and #4 were most similar to the subject, however, because the appellant's comparables were somewhat larger than the subject and the board of review's comparables #1 and #2 were identified as being in deluxe condition. Due to their similarities to the subject, the board of review's comparables #3 and #4 received the most weight in the Board's analysis. These comparables had improvement assessments of $17.23 and $17.39 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of $17.14 per square foot of living area is lower than those of the most similar comparables. 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.

Chairman

Member

Member

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: December 23, 2009

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.