



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

APPELLANT: Michael Kaplan  
DOCKET NO.: 07-24901.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 14-29-414-033-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Michael Kaplan, the appellant, by attorney Arnold G. Siegel 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:** \$ 15,913  
**IMPR.:** \$ 110,555  
**TOTAL:** \$ 126,468

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property consists of a 3,192 square foot parcel improved with a ten-year-old, two-story, average condition, single-family dwelling of masonry construction containing 2,719 square feet of living area and located in Lake View Township, Cook County. Features of the residence include two and one-half bathrooms, a full-finished basement, central air-conditioning, two fireplaces and a two and one-half car detached garage.

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 nine properties suggested as comparable to the subject. The appellant also submitted a three-page brief, photographs and Cook County Assessor's Internet Database sheets for the subject and the suggested comparables as well as a copy of the board of review's decision. Based on the appellant's documents, the nine suggested comparables consist of two-story or three-story, single-family dwellings of frame or

masonry construction located within 4.5 blocks of the subject. The improvements range in size from 2,459 to 3,436 square feet of living area and range in age from seven to nineteen years old. The comparables contain from one and one-half to three and one-half bathrooms. Eight comparables have a finished or unfinished basement, eight comparables contain central air-conditioning, three comparables have fireplaces and six comparables contain a two-car garage. The improvement assessments range from \$25.04 to \$31.82 per square foot of living area. Based on the evidence submitted, 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 \$126,468. The subject's improvement assessment is \$110,555 or \$40.66 per square foot of living area. 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 masonry construction with the same neighborhood code as the subject. The improvements range in size from 2,716 to 3,036 square feet of living area and range in age from seven to sixteen years old. The comparables contain two and one-half or three and one-half bathrooms, a full-finished basement and a two-car garage. Three comparables have central air-conditioning and three comparables have fireplaces. The board's evidence disclosed that the board of review's comparables two and four enjoy deluxe condition, whereas, the subject dwelling is average condition. The improvement assessments range from \$42.18 to \$43.75 per square foot of living area. Based on the evidence presented, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

In rebuttal, the appellant's attorney submitted a one-page letter highlighting various differences between the subject and the board of review's comparables.

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 Board finds the appellant's comparable one and the board of review's comparables one and three to be the most similar properties to the subject in the record. These three properties are similar to the subject in improvement size, amenities, age, design and location and have improvement assessments ranging from

\$31.55 to \$43.12 per square foot of living area. The subject's per square foot improvement assessment of \$40.66 falls within the range established by these properties. The Board finds the appellant's remaining comparables less similar to the subject in improvement size, amenities, exterior construction and design and accorded less weight. The board's two remaining comparables are accorded less weight because they differ from the subject in condition. 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 M. Louie*

Member

*Shawn P. 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: December 23, 2010

*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.