FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION
ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Hugh Spector
DOCKET NO.: 09-21605.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 14-07-421-046-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Hugh Spector, the appellant(s), 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:	$ 30,970
IMPR.:	$ 80,029
TOTAL:	$ 110,999

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property consists of a 8,150 square feet parcel of land containing three improvements. Improvement #1 is a 102 year old, two-story, masonry, single-family dwelling containing 2,641 square feet of living area. Improvement #2 is 102 year old, one and one-half-story, frame, single-family dwelling containing 1,346 square feet of living area. Improvement #3 is a 102 year old, one and one-half story, frame, single family dwelling containing 1,224 square feet of living area. The appellant, via counsel, argued that there was unequal treatment in the assessment process of the subject's improvement #1 as the basis of this appeal.

In support of the equity argument, the appellant submitted descriptive and assessment information for three properties suggested as comparable to improvement #1. The comparables are described as two-story, masonry, single-family dwellings. Additionally, the comparables range: in age from 93 to 114

years; in size from 2,768 to 2,916 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from $14.27 to $17.07 per square foot of living area. The comparables also have various amenities. 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 improvement #1 assessment of $59,352 or $22.47 per square foot of living area, improvement #2 assessment of $9,939 or $7.38 per square foot of living area, and improvement #3 assessment of $10,738 or $8.77 per square foot living area were disclosed. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review presented descriptions and assessment information on suggested comparables for each improvement. For improvement #1, the board of review submitted four properties suggested as comparable and located with the subject's neighborhood code. The properties consist of two-story, masonry, single-family dwellings. The properties range: in age from 95 to 111 years; in size from 2,219 to 3,062 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from $22.42 to $23.65 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's improvement assessment.

For improvement #2, the board of review submitted grid listings for four properties suggested as comparable and located within the subject's neighborhood code. The properties consist of one and one-half-story, frame, single-family dwellings. The properties range: in age from 111 to 116 years; in size from 1,310 to 1,617 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from $16.61 to $17.05 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's improvement assessment.

For improvement #3, the board of review submitted grid listings for four properties suggested as comparable and located within the subject's neighborhood code. The properties consist of one and one-half and two story, frame or masonry, single-family dwellings. The properties range: in age from 101 to 116 years; in size from 1,233 to 2,943 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from $15.97 to $19.25 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's improvement assessment.

The appellant is only appealing improvement #1, as no comparables and/or grid analysis was submitted regarding improvements #2 and #3.

After reviewing the record and considering the evidence, the Property Tax Appeal Board (the "Board") finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal.

The appellant contends unequal treatment in the subject's improvement assessment as the basis of this 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. Walsh v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 181 Ill. 2d 228, 234 (1998) (citing Kankakee Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 131 Ill. 2d 1 (1989)); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.63(e). To succeed in an appeal based on lack of uniformity, the appellant must submit documentation "showing the similarity, proximity and lack of distinguishing characteristics of the assessment comparables to the subject property." Cook Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 403 Ill. App. 3d 139, 145 (1st Dist. 2010); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.65(b). "[T]he critical consideration is not the number of allegedly similar properties, but whether they are in fact 'comparable' to the subject property." Cook Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 403 Ill. App. 3d at 145 (citing DuPage Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 284 Ill. App. 3d 649, 654-55 (2d Dist. 1996)). After an analysis of the assessment data, the Board finds that the appellant has not met this burden.

The Board finds that the appellant’s comparables #1, #2, and #3 and the board of review’s comparables #3 and #4 were most similar to the subject in location, size, style, exterior construction, features, and/or 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 $14.27 to $23.65 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of $22.47 per square foot of living area is within the range established by the most similar comparables. Therefore, after considering adjustments and differences in both parties' comparables when compared to the subject, the Board finds that 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.

Chairman

Member

Member

Member

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: February 21, 2014

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.