



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

APPELLANT: Bob Footlik  
DOCKET NO.: 08-23464.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 05-06-400-025-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Bob Footlik, the appellant, by attorney Michael Griffin 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:** \$ 80,964  
**IMPR.:** \$ 169,632  
**TOTAL:** \$ 250,596

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a two-story dwelling of stucco construction containing 5,472 square feet of living area. The dwelling is 82 years old. Features of the home include a full finished basement, central air conditioning, three fireplaces, and a two-car attached garage. The subject is classified as a class 2-09 residential property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance and is located in Glencoe, New Trier Township, Cook County.

The appellant's appeal is based on unequal treatment in the assessment process. The appellant submitted information on four comparable properties described as two-story stucco, frame, masonry, or frame and masonry dwellings that range in age from 15 to 96 years old. The appellant failed to disclose the comparables' proximity to the subject; however, based on their parcel index numbers, one of the comparables is located on the same block as the subject. The comparable dwellings range in size from 5,032 to 5,425 square feet of living area. Each comparable has central air conditioning, from one to three fireplaces, and an attached garage. The appellant did not provide any information on the comparables' foundations. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$107,190 to \$154,694 or from \$20.79 to \$28.52 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment is \$169,632 or \$31.00 per

square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested that the subject's improvement assessment be reduced to \$148,307 or \$27.10 per square foot of living area.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's final assessment of \$250,596 was disclosed. The board of review presented descriptions and assessment information on four comparable properties consisting of two-story stucco or masonry dwellings that range in age from seven to 109 years old. The comparables have the same assigned neighborhood code as the subject, and one of the comparables is located in the same tax block as the subject. The dwellings range in size from 3,970 to 6,073 square feet of living area. The subject dwelling is described as being of deluxe quality, while the comparable dwellings are described as being of average quality. Each comparable has a full basement, two of which are finished. Each comparable has a garage and from one to eight fireplaces. Two dwellings have central air conditioning. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from \$132,015 to \$214,516 or from \$31.38 to \$37.68 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.

Both parties presented assessment data on a total of eight equity comparables. None of the comparables were similar to the subject in all respects. The board of review described the subject as being of deluxe quality. The board of review's comparables were described as being of average quality, but the appellant did not disclose any similar information for his comparables. In addition, the appellant provided no information on the comparables' foundations. The appellant's comparables #2 and #3 and the board of review's comparables #2 and #3 were considerably newer than the subject. These comparables received reduced weight in the Board's analysis. The board of review's comparable #4 was much smaller in size and also received reduced weight. The Board finds the appellant's comparables #1 and #4 and the board of review's comparable #1 were generally similar to the subject in age and size. Two of these comparables had stucco exterior construction like the subject. 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 \$138,875 to \$190,585 or from \$27.10 to \$31.38 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$169,632 or \$31.00 per square foot of living area falls 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.

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 taxation 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: April 20, 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.