



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

APPELLANT: Amy Savin
DOCKET NO.: 09-29949.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 14-33-329-008-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Amy Savin, the appellant, by attorney Christopher G. Walsh, Jr. 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: \$ 14,760
IMPR.: \$ 67,742
TOTAL: \$ 82,502

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject property is improved with a two-story dwelling of masonry construction containing 2,128 square feet of living area. The dwelling is 141 years old. Features of the home include a slab foundation, and a two-car detached garage. The subject has a parcel of 1,968 square feet and is classified as a class 2-05 residential property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance and is located in Chicago, North 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 described as two-story frame or frame and masonry dwellings that have the same assigned neighborhood and classification codes as the subject. The comparable dwellings range in age from 114 to 131 years old, and they range in size from 2,164 to 2,952 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a crawl-space foundation; one comparable has central air conditioning; and another comparable has a two-car detached garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$56,147 to \$66,728 or of either \$25.95 or \$31.07 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment is \$67,742 or \$31.83 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested that the subject's improvement

assessment be reduced to \$58,860 or \$27.66 per square foot of living area.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's final assessment was disclosed. The board of review presented descriptions and assessment information on four comparable properties consisting of two-story masonry or frame and masonry dwellings that are either 121 or 123 years old. The comparables have the same assigned neighborhood and classification codes as the subject. The dwellings range in size from 1,840 to 2,100 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a full unfinished basement. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from \$61,879 to \$74,204 or from \$33.63 to \$38.33 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 seven equity comparables. All of the comparables submitted were two-story dwellings that were over 100 years old and were located in the same neighborhood as the subject; however, none of the comparables submitted were similar to the subject in all respects. The appellant's comparable #4 was 39% larger in size than the subject and received reduced weight in the Board's analysis. The board of review's comparable #2 was 16% smaller than the subject and also differed in foundation and exterior construction. As a result, this comparable also received reduced weight. The Board finds the board of review's comparable #4 was the most similar to the subject in size. Despite having a full unfinished basement, this comparable was also very similar to the subject in exterior construction. In addition, the appellant's comparables #1 and #2, despite differences in exterior construction, were very similar to the subject in size, and the board of review's comparables #1 and #3, despite differences in foundation, were very similar to the subject in exterior construction and size. 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 \$56,147 to \$74,204 or from \$25.95 to \$38.33 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$67,742 or \$31.83 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

Frank J. Huff

Member

Mark Morris

Member

JR

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: 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.