



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

APPELLANT: Margaret Jura  
DOCKET NO.: 07-29083.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 04-33-302-025-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Margaret Jura, the appellant, by attorney Richard J. Caldarazzo, of Mar Cal Law, P.C. 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:** \$ 11,520  
**IMPR.:** \$ 92,907  
**TOTAL:** \$ 104,427

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject has 12,000 square feet of land, which is improved with a three year old, two-story, masonry, single-family dwelling. The subject's improvement size is 4,895 square feet of living area, which equates to an improvement assessment of \$18.98 per square foot of living area. Its total assessment is \$104,427, which yields a fair market value of \$1,040,110, or \$212.48 per square foot of living area (including land), after applying the 2007 Illinois Department of Revenue three year median level of assessment for Class 2 properties of 10.04%. The appellant, via counsel, argued that there was unequal treatment in the assessment process of the subject's improvement, and also that the fair market value of the subject property was not accurately reflected in its assessed value as the bases of this appeal.

In support of the equity argument, the appellant submitted descriptive and assessment information for four properties suggested as comparable to the subject. The comparables are described as two-story, frame, masonry, or frame and masonry, single-family dwellings. Only comparable #4 is located in the same neighborhood as the subject property. Additionally, the comparables range: in age from 7 to 55 years; in size from 4,368 to 4,705 square feet of living area; and in improvement

assessments from \$13.13 to \$15.65 per square foot of living area. The comparables also have various amenities.

The appellant did not provide any comparable sales in support of the market value argument.

The appellant also submitted a Cook County recorder of deeds printout showing the subject sold in August 2004 for \$373,000 and that the new building was constructed and occupied as of June 9, 2006. As to the evidence of the cost of construction amount of \$432,300, the appellant submitted a typed account totaling the \$432,300 amount with no contractor name or information provided. Also included was a contractor's affidavit for the concrete only totaling \$10,000 from Rainbow Concrete Company. Furthermore, the appellant's pleadings state that the sale was not between related parties, that the subject was advertised for sale on the open market, that the parties used a real estate broker, and that the sale was not pursuant to a foreclosure or a short sale. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The Cook County Board of Review submitted its "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal," wherein the subject's total assessment of \$104,427 was disclosed. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted descriptive and assessment information for four properties suggested as comparable to the subject. All of the comparables are located in the same neighborhood as the subject property. The comparables are described as two-story, masonry, single-family dwellings. Additionally, the comparables range: in age from two to seven years; in size from 4,710 to 4,780 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$20.39 to \$25.47 per square foot of living area. The comparables also have several amenities. The board of review's grid sheet also states that the subject sold in August 2004 for \$373,000, or \$76.20 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

After reviewing the record, considering the evidence, and hearing the testimony, the Property Tax Appeal Board (the "Board") finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal.

When overvaluation is claimed, the appellant has the burden of proving the value of the property by a preponderance of the evidence. Cook Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 339 Ill. App. 3d 529, 545 (1st Dist. 2002); National City Bank of Michigan/Illinois v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 331 Ill. App. 3d 1038, 1042 (3d Dist. 2002) (citing Winnebago Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 313 Ill. App. 3d 179 (2d Dist. 2000)); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.63(e). Proof of market value may consist of an appraisal, a recent arm's length sale of the subject property, recent sales of comparable properties, or recent construction costs of the subject property. Calumet Transfer,

LLC v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 401 Ill. App. 3d 652, 655 (1st Dist. 2010); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.65(c). Having considered the evidence presented, the Board finds that the evidence indicates a reduction is not warranted.

The Board finds that since the appellant's attorney failed to provide any sales comparables in support of a market value argument. The 2004 sale of the subject occurred in too far distant of a date from the date of this appeal and a different tri-annual assessment period. As such, the Board finds that the appellant has not met the burden of a preponderance of the evidence, as there is no range of sales comparables with which to compare the subject. Therefore, the Board finds the subject is not overvalued, and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted based on the sales comparables submitted by the parties.

The appellant contends unequal treatment in the subject's improvement assessment as the basis of this 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. Walsh v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 181 Ill. 2d 228, 234 (1998) (citing Kankakee Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 131 Ill. 2d 1 (1989)); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.63(e). To succeed in an appeal based on lack of uniformity, the appellant must submit documentation "showing the similarity, proximity and lack of distinguishing characteristics of the assessment comparables to the subject property." Cook Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 403 Ill. App. 3d 139, 145 (1st Dist. 2010); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.65(b). "[T]he critical consideration is not the number of allegedly similar properties, but whether they are in fact 'comparable' to the subject property." Cook Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 403 Ill. App. 3d at 145 (citing DuPage Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 284 Ill. App. 3d 649, 654-55 (2d Dist. 1996)). After an analysis of the assessment data, the Board finds that the appellant has not met this burden.

The Board finds that all of the comparables submitted by the board of review were most similar to the subject in location, size, style, exterior construction, features, and age. 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 \$20.39 to \$25.47 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$18.98 per square foot of living area is below the range established by the most similar comparables.

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, 401 (1960). Although the comparables submitted 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 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: August 23, 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.