

# A M E N D E D FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Daniel Albo

DOCKET NO.: 09-22637.001-R-1 PARCEL NO.: 14-30-103-044-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Daniel Albo, the appellant, by attorney Patrick J. Cullerton, of Thompson Coburn LLP in Chicago; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds <u>no change</u> 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:** \$11,875 **IMPR.:** \$56,375 **TOTAL:** \$68,250

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

#### Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Cook County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2009 tax year. The Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of the appeal.

## Findings of Fact

The subject property has a 3,125 square foot site improved with two buildings. Improvement #1 is a 100-year-old, two-story, dwelling of frame construction, containing 2,196 square feet of living area and featuring a full basement and five bedrooms. Improvement #2 is a 100-year-old, one-story, dwelling of frame construction, containing 666 square feet of living area and featuring a full basement and two bedrooms.

The property is located in Lake View Township, Cook County. Both improvements are classified as a class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant submitted an appeal petition before the Property Tax Appeal Board contending assessment inequity and a contention of law as the bases of the appeal. In support of the inequity argument, the appellant submitted information on five suggested equity comparables. The appellant's grid does not differentiate between improvement #1 and improvement #2. In addition, the appellant's data reflects \$38,799 as improvement assessment or \$17.67 per square foot.

The appellant also argues that the subject's 2010 assessment was reduced; therefore, the subject's 2009 assessment should also be reduced to avoid an unfair and unjust result. In support of this proposition, the appellant cited <u>Hoyne Savings & Loan Association v. Hare</u>, 60 Ill.2d 84, 322 N.E.2d 833 (1974) and  $\underline{400}$  Condominium Association v. Tully, 79 Ill.App.3d 686, 398 N.E.2d 951 (1st Dist. 1979). In <u>Hoyne</u>, the appellant argued the court held that a substantial reduction in a subsequent tax bill is indicative of validity of prior tax years' assessment. In  $\underline{400}$  Condominium Association, the appellant argued the Illinois Supreme Court cited and followed  $\underline{Hoyne}$  in that a substantial reduction in a subsequent tax bill is indicative of validity of prior years' assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing an initial total assessment for the subject of \$73,520 with a subsequent reduction, upon re-review, to final total assessment at \$68,250. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$56,375. The board of review's the improvement indicates that assessment improvement #1 is \$38,799 or \$17.67 per square foot of living area, and \$17,576 or \$26.39 per square foot of living area for improvement #2. In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four suggested equity comparables for improvement #1 and five suggested equity comparables for improvement #2.

#### Conclusion of Law

The Board gave no weight to the appellant's reliance regarding the appellant's contention of law referencing  $\underline{\text{Hoyne}}$  and  $\underline{400}$   $\underline{\text{Condominium Association}}$ , [citations omitted]. The Board finds in the recent decision of  $\underline{\text{Moroney \& Co. v. Property Tax Appeal Board}}$ , 2013 IL App (1<sup>st</sup>) 120493, 2 N.E.3d 522, the Court at ¶46 did not perceive  $\underline{\text{Hoyne}}$  and  $\underline{400}$  Condominium as standing for the proposition that "subsequent actions by assessing officials are fertile grounds to demonstrate a mistake in a prior year's assessments." In Moroney, the Court wrote in pertinent part:

... in each of those unique cases, which are confined to their facts, there were glaring errors in the tax assessments -- in Hoyne, the assessment was increased on a property from \$9,510 to \$246,810 in one year even though no changes or improvements to the property had occurred (Hoyne, 60 Ill.2d at 89), and in Condominium, assessments on a garage were assessed separately from the adjoining condominium in violation of the Condominium Property Act (400 Condominium, 79 Ill.App.3d at 691). Here, based upon the evidence that was submitted, there is no evidence that there was error in the calculation of an Rather, the record shows that the 2005 assessment. assessment was properly calculated based on the market value of the property.

The Property Tax Appeal Board finds the appellant presented no credible evidence showing there were unusual circumstances present in this 2009 appeal relative to the establishment of the subject's assessment for the 2010 tax year.

The taxpayer also contends assessment inequity as the basis of the appeal. When unequal treatment in the assessment process is the basis of the appeal, the inequity of the assessments must be proved by clear and convincing evidence. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). Proof of unequal treatment in the assessment process should consist of documentation of the assessments for the assessment year in question of not less than three comparable properties showing the similarity, proximity distinguishing characteristics of the assessment comparables to the subject property. 86 Ill.Admin.Code The Board finds the appellant did not meet this §1910.65(b). burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity for improvement #1 to be appellant's comparables #3 through #5, and the board of review's comparable #2. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$15.04 to \$22.26 per square foot of living area. Improvement #1's improvement assessment of \$17.67 per square foot of living area falls within the range established by the best comparables in this record.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity for improvement #2 to be all of the board of review's comparables. These comparables had improvement assessment that ranged from \$33.58 to \$40.12 per square foot of living area. Improvement #2's improvement assessment of \$26.39 per square foot of living area falls below the range established by the best comparables in this record.

Based on this record the Board finds the appellant did not demonstrate with clear and convincing evidence that the subject's improvement was inequitably assessed and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not justified.

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
21. Fer	Mauro Morios
Member	Member
C. R.	Jany White
Member	Acting Member
DISSENTING:	

## CERTIFICATION

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:	June 26, 2015
	Alportol
•	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.