



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

APPELLANT: Michael Vdovets
DOCKET NO.: 10-27876.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 04-07-406-010-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Michael Vdovets, the appellant(s); 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: \$ 14,490
IMPR.: \$ 48,819
TOTAL: \$ 63,309

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject has 25,200 square feet of land, which is improved with a 22 year old, two-story, single-family dwelling. The subject's improvement size is 3,762 square feet of living area, which equates to an improvement assessment of \$12.98 per square foot of living area. The appellant argued that there was unequal treatment in the assessment process of the subject's improvement as the basis of this appeal.

In support of the equity argument, the appellant submitted descriptive and assessment information for four properties suggested as comparable to the subject. The comparables are described as two-story, masonry, single-family dwellings. Additionally, the comparables range: in age from 16 to 38 years; in size from 3,528 to 4,797 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$12.82 to \$13.75 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 Cook County Board of Review submitted its "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal," wherein the subject's improvement assessment of \$48,819 was disclosed. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted descriptive and assessment information for four properties suggested as comparable to the subject. The comparables are described as two-story, masonry or frame and masonry, single-family dwellings. Additionally, the comparables range: in age from ten to 15 years; in size from 3,274 to 3,619 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$15.38 to \$17.56 per square foot of living area. The comparables also have several amenities. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's improvement assessment.

At hearing, the appellant argued that the comparables submitted by the board of review are newer and better built structures, that some of the comparables have a three-car garage, and that they are of masonry exterior construction and that his property is constructed of dryvit which is a banned installation due to design defects that traps moisture and causes exterior enclosure to deteriorate. He also added that he is facing significant expense of replacing all exteriors of his property. He also argued that he has well water and that it will cost him \$25,000 to connect his property to city water.

In rebuttal, the appellant submitted new evidence that could not be considered by the Board due to the Property Tax Appeal Board Rules. PTAB Rule §1910.66(c) ("Rebuttal evidence shall not consist of new evidence such as an appraisal or newly discovered comparable properties. A party to the appeal shall be precluded from submitting its own case in chief in the guise of rebuttal evidence.")

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 Comparables #1, and #4 submitted by the appellant, and Comparables #1, #2, and #4 submitted by the board of review 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 \$12.82 to \$16.36 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$12.98 per square foot of living area is within the range established by the most similar comparables.

The constitutional provision for uniformity of taxation and valuation does not require a mathematical equality. A practical, rather than an absolute one, is the test. Apex Motor Fuel Co. v. Barrett, 20 Ill. 2d. 395, 401 (1960). Although the comparables submitted by the parties disclosed that properties located in the same area are not assessed at identical levels, all 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 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. Crit

Chairman

K. L. Ferr

Member

Member

Mario M. Lino

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 18, 2014

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.