



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

APPELLANT: Juan Prada
DOCKET NO.: 07-28179.001-R-1 through 07-28179.002-R-1
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Juan Prada, the appellant, 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:

DOCKET NO	PARCEL NUMBER	LAND	IMPRVMT	TOTAL
07-28179.001-R-1	13-36-230-002-0000	7,244	22,320	\$29,564
07-28179.002-R-1	13-36-230-003-0000	7,244	21,679	\$28,923

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property is improved with two improvements. Improvement #1, identified by Permanent Index Number 13-36-230-002-0000, is a 95 year old, two-story, masonry, 2,500 square foot, mixed-use building that is situated on a 2,625 square foot lot. Features include three apartments, one commercial unit and a partial unfinished basement. Improvement #2, identified by Permanent Index Number 13-36-230-003-0000, is a 113 year old, two-story, masonry, 2,500 square foot, mixed-use building that is situated on a 2,625 square foot lot. Features include four apartments, two commercial units, and a partial unfinished basement.

The appellant submitted evidence before the Property Tax Appeal Board claiming unequal treatment in the assessment process as the basis of the appeal. In support of this claim, the appellant submitted descriptions and assessment information regarding three suggested comparable properties located on the subject property's street. The suggested comparables are described as two-story, masonry, or frame, mixed-use buildings that range in age from 96 to 113 years old and range in size from 3,019 to 11,907 square

feet of living area. Features include air conditioning, four or six apartments, and a partial unfinished basement. These properties have improvement assessments that range from \$2.64 to \$5.92 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment is \$8.93 per square foot of living area for the first improvement and \$8.67 for the second improvement. 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 assessment of \$29,564 for Improvement #1 and \$28,923 for Improvement #2 was disclosed. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review presented descriptions and assessment information regarding three suggested comparable properties for Improvement #1 and four suggested comparables for Improvement #2.

With regard to Improvement #1, the board of review submitted four suggested comparables that consist of two-story, masonry, mixed-use buildings that range in age from 106 to 110 years old and range in size from 2,400 to 2,814 square feet of building area. Features include a partial unfinished basement, two or three apartments, and one commercial unit. These properties have improvement assessments that range from \$11.31 to \$12.33 per square foot of building area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

With regard to Improvement #2, the board of review submitted three suggested comparables that consist of two-story, masonry, mixed-use buildings that range in age from 91 to 113 years old and range in size from 2,400 to 2,772 square feet of building area. Features include a partial unfinished basement, two, three or four apartments, and one or two commercial units. These properties have improvement assessments that range from \$11.98 to \$12.36 per square foot of building 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.

With regard to Improvement #1, the parties submitted a total of seven suggested comparables. The Board finds the suggested comparables submitted by the board of review are the most similar

to the subject in age, size, design, and amenities. Due to their similarities to the subject, these comparables received the most weight in the Board's analysis. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$11.31 to \$12.33 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$8.93 per square foot of living area is below 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 Improvement #1's improvement assessment is equitable and no reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

With regard to Improvement #2, the parties submitted a total of six suggested comparables. The Board finds the suggested comparables submitted by the board of review are the most similar to the subject in age, size, design, and amenities. Due to their similarities to the subject, these comparables received the most weight in the Board's analysis. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$11.98 to \$12.36 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$8.67 per square foot of living area is below 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 Improvement #2's improvement assessment is equitable and no reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The constitutional provision for uniformity of taxation and valuation does not require a mathematical equality. A practical, 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 parties disclosed that properties located in the same area are not assessed at identical levels, all 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: February 24, 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.