



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

APPELLANT: Robert Pommer
DOCKET NO.: 08-25942.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 04-13-304-021-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Robert Pommer, the appellant, by attorney Mitchell L. Klein, of Schiller Klein PC 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: \$ 13,409
IMPR.: \$ 202,865
TOTAL: \$ 216,274

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property is improved with a two-story dwelling of masonry construction. The dwelling is nine years old and contains 5,455 square feet of living area. Features of the home include a partial finished basement, central air conditioning, two fireplaces, and a three-car garage. The subject is located in Northfield, Northfield Township, Cook County.

The appellant's appeal is based on unequal treatment in the assessment process. The appellant submitted information on three suggested comparable properties described as two-story dwellings of frame or masonry construction. The comparable properties have the same assigned neighborhood code as the subject. The comparable dwellings are either seven or twelve years old and contain from 5,408 to 5,685 square feet of living area. One comparable has a full finished basement, and two have unfinished basements, either full or partial. Each comparable has central air conditioning and a garage. Comparable #1 has five fireplaces; comparable #3 has two fireplaces; and comparable #2 does not have a fireplace. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$136,462 to \$155,256 or from \$24.68 to \$27.30 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment is \$202,865 or \$37.18 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested that the

subject's improvement assessment be reduced to \$134,975 or \$24.74 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 \$216,274 was disclosed. The board of review presented descriptions and assessment information on four suggested comparable properties consisting of two-story dwellings of masonry construction. The comparable properties have the same assigned neighborhood code as the subject, and one of the comparables is located one-quarter mile from the subject. The dwellings are from one to seven years old and contain from 5,441 to 6,476 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a full unfinished basement, central air conditioning, from two to four fireplaces, and a garage. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from \$196,625 to \$233,508 or from \$35.00 to \$38.59 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

In rebuttal, the appellant's attorney noted the following differences between the subject and the comparables submitted by the board of review: Two of the board of review comparables were located in a different municipality than the subject; three of the board of review's comparables were much newer than the subject; the board of review's comparables had more bathrooms than the subject; two of the board of review's comparables had more fireplaces than the subject; and the board of review's comparables had full basements compared to the subject's partial basement.

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 seven suggested comparables. The board of review's comparable #1 was significantly larger in size than the subject and received reduced weight in the Board's analysis. The Board finds that the appellant's comparables and the board of review's comparables #2 through #4 were similar to the subject in age, size, exterior construction, and features in varying degrees. The board of review's comparable #2 was most similar in location; the appellant's comparables #1 and #2 and the board of review's comparable #2 were most similar in age; and the appellant's comparable #2 and the board of review's comparable #3 were most

similar in size. As a result, these six comparables received the most weight in the Board's analysis. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$136,462 to \$233,508 or from \$24.68 to \$38.59 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$202,865 or \$37.19 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.

Ronald 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: July 19, 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.