



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

APPELLANT: Dirk Ahlbeck  
DOCKET NO.: 07-25871.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 09-26-106-005-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Dirk Ahlbeck, the appellant(s), by attorney Edward Larkin, of Larkin & Larkin in Park Ridge; 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:** \$10,268  
**IMPR.:** \$107,808  
**TOTAL:** \$118,076

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property consists of a 7,550 square foot parcel of land improved with a nine-year old, two-story, frame and masonry, single-family dwelling containing 2,909 square feet of living area, three and one-half baths, a fireplace, air conditioning, and a full, finished basement. The appellant, via counsel, argued there was unequal treatment in the assessment process of the improvement as the basis of this appeal.

In support of the equity argument, the appellant submitted information on a total of three properties suggested as comparable. The properties are described as two-story, masonry or frame and masonry, single-family dwellings. Features include two between two and one-half and four baths, two fireplaces, air conditioning for two properties, and, for all properties, partial or full basements with one finished. The properties range: in age from 7 to 21 years; in size from 3,112 to 3,212 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$21.55 to \$22.57 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 improvement assessment of \$107,808 or \$37.06 per square foot of living area was disclosed. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted descriptions and assessment information on three properties suggested as comparable. The properties are described as two-story, frame or frame and masonry, single-family dwellings. Features include two and one-half or two and two-half baths, one or two fireplaces, air conditioning for one property, and, for three properties, a full basement with one finished. The properties range: in age from 13 to 52 years; in size from 2,159 to 3,069 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$37.06 to \$37.77 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 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 PTAB finds the appellant has not met this burden.

The parties presented a total of six properties suggested as comparable. The PTAB finds the board of review's comparable #3 and the appellant's comparables #2 and #3 most similar to the subject in size, design, construction, age and/or location. The properties range: in age from 7 to 13 years; in size from 3,069 to 3,212 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$22.53 to \$37.06 per square foot of living area. In comparison, the subject's improvement assessment of \$37.06 per square foot of living area is within the range of these comparables. Therefore, after considering adjustments and the differences in both parties' comparables when compared to the subject, the Board finds the subject's per square foot improvement assessment is supported and a reduction in the improvement 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.

*Ronald R. Cuit*

Chairman

*Frank J. Huff*

Member

*Mario M. Louie*

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.