



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

APPELLANT: Anthony Zitella  
DOCKET NO.: 10-31037.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 03-19-211-030-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Anthony Zitella, the appellant(s); and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds a reduction 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: \$ 4,009**  
**IMPR: \$ 46,528**  
**TOTAL: \$ 50,537**

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject has 8,910 square feet of land, which is improved with a two year old, two-story, frame and masonry, single-family dwelling. The subject's improvement size is 3,049 square feet of living area, which equates to an improvement assessment of \$17.91 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, frame or masonry, single-family dwellings. Additionally, the comparables range: in age from three to seven years; in size from 3,264 to 3,752 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$13.48 to \$16.49 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 \$54,608 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, frame and masonry, single-family dwellings. Additionally, the comparables range: in age from three to ten years; in size from 3,101 to 3,415 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$17.85 to \$20.02 per square foot of living area. The comparables also have several amenities. The board of review's evidence also states that the subject's assessment for tax year 2011 was \$50,537. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's improvement assessment.

In rebuttal, the appellant argued that the board of review's comparables were all located in another subdivision, and that the board of review reduced the subject's improvement assessment to \$46,528 for tax year 2011. This improvement assessment resulted in a total assessment of \$50,537 for the subsequent tax year after adding the land assessment back in.

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 all of the comparables submitted by both parties 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 \$13.48 to \$20.02 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$17.91 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 based on equity.

However, evidence showing that the subject received a reduction in a later assessment year is admissible, and can be a relevant factor in determining whether the assessment for the tax year at issue is grossly excessive. Hoyne Savings & Loan Ass'n. v. Hare, 60 Ill. 2d 84, 90 (1974); see also 400 Condominium Ass'n. v. Tully, 79 Ill. App. 3d 686 (1979). When such evidence is taken into account, consideration must be given to any changes in the property that may have changed the subject's assessed value. Hoyne, 60 Ill. 2d at 90. After an analysis of the assessment data, the Board finds that a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The Board finds that, under Hoyne, it can consider the 2011 reduction by the board of review. The Board further finds that the best evidence of the subject's 2010 assessment is the decision rendered by the board of review for the subject's 2011 assessment. As described above, the subject's assessed value under the board of review's 2011 decision is \$50,537. Based on this record the Board finds that the subject property should have an assessed value of \$50,537 for tax year 2010. The subject's current assessed value is above this amount, and, therefore, the Board finds that a 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

*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 20, 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.