



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

APPELLANT: Stuart Altschuler  
DOCKET NO.: 08-20180.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 14-29-215-014-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Stuart Altschuler, the appellant(s), by attorney Donald T. Rubin, of Rubin & Norris 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:** \$ 16,944  
**IMPR.:** \$ 111,856  
**TOTAL:** \$ 128,800

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property contains a 3,690 square foot parcel of land improved with a three-story dwelling of masonry construction containing 4,378 square feet of living area. The dwelling is 108 years old. Features of the home include a three baths, air conditioning, a full basement with a recreation room, and a two-car garage.

The appellant's appeal is based on unequal treatment in the assessment process. The appellant submitted descriptions and assessment information on three comparable properties described as two-story or three-story, frame or masonry dwellings located on the subject's block or within blocks of the subject. These properties range: in age from 103 to 118 years; in size from 2,499 to 4,974 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$18.95 to \$24.26 square feet of living area. Features include two to five and two half-baths, and a two-car garage. One property has air conditioning, while another contains a fireplace. The subject's improvement assessment is \$25.55 per square feet 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 \$128,800 was disclosed. The board of review presented description and assessment information on one comparable property located within one-quarter mile of the subject, consisting of a three-story, masonry dwelling that is 117 years old. The dwelling contains 4,350 square feet of living area. Features include three and one half-baths, a partial basement with a recreation room, two fireplaces, air conditioning, and a three-car garage. The property has an improvement assessment of \$27.59 per square foot of living area.

In rebuttal, the appellant's attorney also argued that the evidence tendered by the board of review is insufficient and in violation of PTAB's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

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 #1 and #2 submitted by the appellant and the comparable submitted by the board of review were most similar to the subject in location, size, exterior construction 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 \$18.95 to \$27.59 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$25.55 per square foot of living area is within 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 the subject's improvement assessment is equitable and a reduction in the subject's 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.

*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.