



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

APPELLANT: Michigan Shores Club  
DOCKET NO.: 07-23968.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 05-26-101-022-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Michigan Shores Club, 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 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:** \$ 35,663  
**IMPR.:** \$ 81,617  
**TOTAL:** \$ 117,280

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a two-story dwelling of stucco construction. The dwelling is 96 years old and contains 2,694 square feet of living area. Features of the home include a slab foundation, two fireplaces, and a two-car detached garage. The subject dwelling is classified as a class 2-06 residential property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance and is located at 929 Michigan Avenue, Wilmette, New Trier Township, Cook County.<sup>1</sup>

The appellant's appeal is based on unequal treatment in the assessment process. The appellant submitted information on three suggested comparable properties described as two-story dwellings of frame or stucco construction. The comparable properties have the same assigned classification and neighborhood codes as the subject. The comparable dwellings are from 94 to 129 years old and contain from 2,354 to 2,886 square feet of living area. One dwelling has a crawl-space foundation, and two have partial unfinished basements. Two comparables have garages, and two have fireplaces. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging

---

<sup>1</sup> Class 2-06 is a two or more story residence, over 62 years of age, 2,201 to 4,999 square feet. On the residential appeal form, the appellant misidentified the address of the subject property as 911 Michigan Avenue in Wilmette.

from \$58,111 to \$74,641 or from \$23.98 to \$25.86 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment is \$81,617 or \$30.30 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested that the subject's improvement assessment be reduced to \$69,828 or \$25.92 per square foot of living area.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's final assessment of \$117,280 was disclosed. The board of review presented descriptions and assessment information on three suggested comparable properties consisting of two-story dwellings of stucco construction. The comparable properties have the same assigned neighborhood and classification codes as the subject. One of the comparables is located in the same tax block as the subject, and another is said to be located one-quarter mile from the subject. The dwellings are from 91 to 105 years old and contain from 2,220 to 2,540 square feet of living area. Two dwellings have full unfinished basements, and one has a full finished basement. Each comparable has two fireplaces; one has central air conditioning; and two have garages. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from \$73,790 to \$81,868. On a per square foot basis, these comparables have improvement assessments of either \$31.53 or \$36.88 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.

Both parties presented assessment data on a total of six suggested comparables. All of the comparables submitted were two-story dwellings with the same neighborhood and classification codes as the subject. The appellant's comparable #2 was much older than the subject and also differed in exterior construction. As a result, this comparable received reduced weight in the Board's analysis.

The Board finds that the appellant's comparables #1 and #3 and the comparables submitted by the board of review were very similar to the subject in size, age, and exterior construction. Additionally, the board of review's comparable #1 was located in the same tax block as the subject, and the board of review's comparable #2 was said to be located one-quarter mile from the

subject. Despite differences in foundation, these comparables received the most weight in the Board's analysis. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$58,111 to \$81,868 or from \$23.98 to \$36.88 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$81,617 or \$30.30 per square foot of living area falls within the range established by 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.

The constitutional provision for uniformity of taxation and valuation does not require mathematical equality. The requirement is satisfied if the intent is evident to adjust the taxation burden with a reasonable degree of uniformity and if such is the effect of the statute enacted by the General Assembly establishing the method of assessing real property in its general operation. A practical uniformity, rather than an absolute one, is the test. Apex Motor Fuel Co. v. Barrett, 20 Ill. 2d 395 (1960). Although the comparables presented by the appellant disclosed that properties located in the same area are not assessed at identical levels, all that the constitution requires is a practical uniformity which appears to exist on the basis of the evidence. For the foregoing reasons, the Board finds that the appellant has not proven by clear and convincing evidence that the subject property is inequitably assessed. Therefore, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that the subject's assessment as established by the board of review is correct and no reduction 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.

*Donald R. Cuit*

Chairman

*K. L. Fern*

Member

*Frank A. Huff*

Member

*Mario Morris*

Member

*J. R.*

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: June 22, 2012

*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.