



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

APPELLANT: Elliot Jaffe  
DOCKET NO.: 07-27922.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 04-10-315-031-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Elliot Jaffe, the appellant, by attorney Stephanie Park, of Park & Longstreet, P.C. of Rolling Meadows; 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:** \$8,180  
**IMPR.:** \$32,955  
**TOTAL:** \$41,135

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a one-story dwelling of frame construction containing 1,185 square feet of living area. The dwelling is 56 years old. Features of the home include a partial unfinished basement, a fireplace and a 1.5-car garage.

The appellant's appeal is based on unequal treatment in the assessment process. The appellant submitted information on twelve comparable properties located in "neighborhood 132". The comparables consist of one-story or 1.5 to 1.9-story frame, masonry or frame and masonry dwellings that range in age from 49 to 91 years old. The comparable dwellings range in size from 1,080 to 1,388 square feet of living area. Seven comparables have partial basements, three of which are finished with recreation rooms. Two comparables have full unfinished basements and three comparables have crawl-space or concrete slab foundations. Eleven comparables have garages ranging from 1-car to 2.5-car. Four comparables have central air conditioning and two comparables have fireplaces. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$21.68 to \$26.07 per square

foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment is \$27.81 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 \$41,135 was disclosed. The board of review presented descriptions and assessment information on four comparable properties located in the same neighborhood code as the subject. The comparables consist of one-story frame dwellings that range in age from 55 to 59 years old. The dwellings range in size from 1,107 to 1,241 square feet of living area. Three comparables have partial unfinished basements and one comparable has a concrete slab foundation. Three comparables have 1-car or 1.5-car garages. Two comparables have central air conditioning and two comparables have fireplaces. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from \$29.84 to \$33.16 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 comparables #4, #6, #7, #8, #11 and #12 submitted by the appellant and comparable #2 submitted by the board of review dissimilar in basement foundation and/or finish when compared to the subject and less weight was given to these properties. The Board also finds comparables #1, #3 and #10 presented by the appellant to be dissimilar in age when compared to the subject and less weight was given to these properties. The Board finds comparables #2, #5 and #9 submitted by the appellant and comparables #1, #3 and #4 submitted by the board of review were similar to the subject in design, exterior construction, age, size and features. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$22.99 to \$33.16 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$27.81 per square foot of living area falls within the range established by these 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 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.