



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

APPELLANT: Brian Passmore  
DOCKET NO.: 12-28923.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 16-13-302-037-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Brian Passmore, the appellant, by attorney Brian P. Liston, of the Law Offices of Liston & Tsantilis, P.C. in Chicago; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented in this matter, 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:** \$ 3,125  
**IMPR.:** \$16,753  
**TOTAL:** \$19,878

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 2012 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 consists of a 116-year-old, three-story, three-unit apartment building with 4,086 square feet of building area of masonry construction. The property has a 3,125 square foot site and is located in West Chicago Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted information on nine suggested sales comparables.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$19,878. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$198,780 or \$48.65 per square foot of building area, including land, when applying the 2012

statutory level of assessment for class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance of 10%.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four suggested equity comparables with sales data on each property.

At hearing, appellant's attorney reiterated the sales comparables argument. The board of review distinguished the appellant's suggested comparables #1, #3, and #4 based on the distance from the subject property and township. In rebuttal, appellant's attorney distinguished the subject property from the board of review's suggested comparables #1, #2, and #4, based on the square footage. Finally, appellant's attorney submitted Appellant's Hearing Exhibit A showing that the subject's 2013 assessment was reduced. Counsel argued the subject's 2013 assessment was reduced; therefore, the subject's 2012 assessment should also be reduced to avoid an unfair and unjust result. Counsel did not cite any case law to support this proposition.

### **Conclusion of Law**

The Board gave no weight to the appellant's reliance on the subject's 2013 decreased assessment. The Board finds in the recent decision of 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 Hoyne and 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." Hoyne Savings & Loan Association v. Hare, 60 Ill.2d 84, 322 N.E.2d 833 (1974) and 400 Condominium Association v. Tully, 79 Ill.App.3d 686, 398 N.E.2d 951 (1<sup>st</sup> Dist. 1979). 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 400 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 an error in the calculation of the 2005 assessment. Rather, the record shows that the 2005 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 2012 appeal relative to the establishment of the subject's assessment for the 2013 tax year. Moreover, the board of review submitted the subject's property characteristic printout reflecting that the subject is not owner-occupied.

The appellant also contends the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in its assessed valuation. When market value is the basis of the appeal the value of the property must be proved by a preponderance of the evidence. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). Proof of market value may consist of an appraisal of the subject property, a recent sale, comparable sales or construction costs. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(c). The Board finds the appellant did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be appellant's comparable sales #5, #7, and #8, and the board of review comparable sale #3. These comparables sold for prices ranging from \$14.20 to \$96.70 per square foot of building area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$48.65 per square foot of building area, including land, which is within the range established by the best comparable sales in this record. Based on this evidence the Board finds 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



Member



Member



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: March 24, 2017



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.