



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

APPELLANT: Kevin Coogan  
DOCKET NO.: 09-04256.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 03-16-301-016

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Kevin Coogan, the appellant, by attorney Lisa A. Marino, of Marino & Assoc., PC in Chicago; and the DuPage 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 DuPage County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

**LAND:** \$42,180  
**IMPR.:** \$55,320  
**TOTAL:** \$97,500

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property consists of a one-story brick dwelling built in 1962. The subject contains 1,282 square feet of living area with a full, partially finished basement. Features include air-conditioning and a detached garage containing 440 square feet of building area.

The appellant, through counsel, appeared before the Property Tax Appeal Board claiming unequal treatment in the assessment process as the basis of the appeal. The appellant is not disputing the subject's land assessment. In support of the inequity argument, the appellant submitted a grid analysis of three suggested comparable properties. The comparables are one-story frame, brick or brick and frame dwellings that were built in 1955 or 1960. Each comparable is located in the same neighborhood as the subject and within 3.5 blocks of subject. Two comparables have air-conditioning and each has a garage ranging from 252 to 576 square feet of building area. The comparables are described as containing from 1,100 to 1,610 square feet of living area and have improvement assessments ranging from \$42,260 to \$62,600 or

from \$35.63 to \$39.86 per square foot of living area. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$55,320 or \$43.15 per square foot 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 \$97,500 was disclosed. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review presented a grid analysis detailing five suggested comparable properties located in the same neighborhood as the subject. The comparable properties consist of one-story brick dwellings that were built from 1960 to 1962. Each comparable has a full, partially finished basement; each has a detached garage containing either 440 or 528 square feet of building area. The comparables range in size from 1,161 to 1,282 square foot of living area. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$50,600 to \$55,780 or from \$43.51 to \$43.61 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

After hearing the testimony 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 Property Tax Appeal Board further finds that a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The appellant's argument was unequal treatment in the assessment process. The Illinois Supreme Court has held that 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). The evidence must demonstrate a consistent pattern of assessment inequities within the assessment jurisdiction. 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 that were similar to the subject in location and design. The appellant's comparables were dissimilar to the subject because they did not contain a basement, while the subject has a full, partially finished basement. In addition, one of the appellant's comparables was larger in size when compared to the subject. For these reasons the Board gave the appellant's comparables reduced weight in its analysis. The board of review's comparables were generally more similar to the subject in size, age and finished basement area, and therefore, received the greatest weight in the Board's analysis. They had improvement assessments ranging from \$50,600 to \$55,780 or from \$43.51 to \$43.61 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$55,320 or \$43.15 per square foot of living area and is less than four of the comparables submitted by the board of review. After considering adjustments and the differences in both parties' suggested comparables when compared

to the subject property, the Board finds the subject's improvement assessment is supported by the most comparable properties contained in this record and a reduction in the subject's improvement 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 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 parties 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 presented.

As a result of this analysis, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds the appellant has not adequately demonstrated that the subject dwelling was inequitably assessed by clear and convincing evidence and a reduction 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: September 21, 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.