



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

APPELLANT: James Winn
DOCKET NO.: 07-25763.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 05-30-202-049-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are James Winn, the appellant, by attorney Adam E. Bossov, of the Law Offices of Adam E. Bossov, 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: \$81,967
IMPR.: \$49,827
TOTAL: \$131,794

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property is improved with a one-story dwelling of masonry construction containing 3,055 square feet of living area. The dwelling is 46 years old. Features of the home include a partial basement finished with a recreation room, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a 2-car garage.

The appellant's appeal is based on unequal treatment in the assessment process and contention of law¹. The appellant submitted information on eight comparable properties with the same neighborhood code as the subject. The comparables consist of one-story, 1.5 to 1.9-story or two-story masonry or frame and masonry dwellings that range in age from 47 to 53 years old. The comparable dwellings range in size from 3,730 to 7,120 square feet of living area. Three comparables have full basements of which one is finished with a recreation room, two comparables have partial unfinished basements and three comparables have

¹ While a brief was presented, the arguments pertain to the assessment of the subject as compared to the comparables presented.

crawl-space or concrete slab foundations. Each comparable has from one to three fireplaces and a garage from 2-car to 4-car. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$7.52 to \$15.00 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment is \$16.31 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 of \$131,794 was disclosed. The board of review presented descriptions and assessment information on four comparable properties located in the same neighborhood code as the subject. Comparable #1 is located in the same block and on the same street as the subject. The comparables consist of one-story masonry dwellings that are 45 or 47 years old. The dwellings range in size from 2,723 to 3,453 square feet of living area. Two comparables have full basements of which one is finished with a recreation room, one comparable has a partial unfinished basement and one comparable has a crawl-space foundation. Each comparable has central air conditioning, one or two fireplaces and a 2-car to 3-car garage. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from \$16.31 to \$19.06 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 a reduction is not warranted.

The Board finds comparables #3, #4, #5, #7 and #8 submitted by the appellant are dissimilar in design when compared to the subject and less weight was given to these properties. The Board finds comparables #2 and #8 submitted by the appellant and comparable #2 submitted by the board of review are dissimilar in basement foundation when compared to the subject and less weight was given to these properties. The Board finds comparables #1, #5 and #6 submitted by the appellant are dissimilar in size when compared to the subject and less weight was given to these properties. The Board finds comparables #1, #3 and #4 submitted by the board of review were most similar to the subject in location, design, basement foundation and size. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$16.31 to \$18.33 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$16.31 per square foot of living area

falls within the range established by the most similar comparables. After considering adjustments to the comparables for differences 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 Board gave no weight to the appellant's contention of law argument.

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 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: July 20, 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.