



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

APPELLANT: Carol Starkman
DOCKET NO.: 08-23494.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 17-33-118-001-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Carol Starkman, 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: \$ 10,709
IMPR.: \$ 39,515
TOTAL: \$ 50,224**

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property is improved with a two-story, mixed-use commercial and multi-family building of masonry construction. The building is 90 years old and contains 6,079 square feet of building area. The building has four apartment units, one commercial unit, a partial unfinished basement, and a one and one-half car detached garage. The subject is classified as a class 2-12 residential property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance and is located in Chicago, South Chicago Township, Cook County.

The appellant's appeal is based on unequal treatment in the assessment process. The appellant submitted information on three comparable properties that are classified as class 2-12, mixed-use commercial and multi-family buildings. The buildings have masonry exterior construction, but the appellant did not disclose the number of stories in each building. Based on their parcel index numbers, one of the comparables is located in the same block as the subject property, and another is located on the same street, one block away. The buildings range in age from 74 to 110 years old and in size from 4,176 to 10,255 square feet of building area. The appellant did not provide any information on the comparables' foundations. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$14,332 to \$54,726 or \$3.43 to \$5.89 per square foot of building area. The subject's improvement

assessment is \$39,515 or \$6.50 per square foot of building area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested that the subject's improvement assessment be reduced to \$32,441 or \$5.34 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 \$50,224 was disclosed. The board of review presented descriptions and assessment information on four comparable properties consisting of two-story masonry buildings that range in age from 76 to 115 years old. The comparables have the same neighborhood and classification codes as the subject. The buildings are mixed-use commercial and multi-family, and they have from two to five apartment units and one commercial unit. The comparables contain from 5,306 to 6,800 square feet of building area. Each building has an unfinished basement, either full or partial. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from \$37,140 to \$46,198 or \$6.79 to \$7.76 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.

The parties presented assessment data on a total of seven equity comparables. All of the comparables submitted were mixed-use commercial and multi-family masonry buildings like the subject property. They were also generally similar in age. However, the appellant's comparables #1 and #2 differed from the subject in building area and received reduced weight in the Board's analysis. The Board finds the appellant's comparable #3 was most similar to the subject in building area and the board of review's comparable #4 was most similar in age. In addition, the board of review's comparables were two-story buildings with unfinished basements like the subject, and they were generally similar in building area. Due to their similarities to the subject, these five comparables received the most weight in the Board's analysis. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$35,607 to \$46,198 or \$5.89 to \$7.76 per square foot of building area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$39,515 or \$6.50 per square foot of building 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.