



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

APPELLANT: Keith Bank
DOCKET NO.: 15-02472.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 16-23-207-094

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Keith Bank, the appellant, by attorney Robert Rosenfeld, of Robert H. Rosenfeld and Associates, LLC in Chicago; and the Lake 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 **Lake** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$195,582
IMPR.: \$465,125
TOTAL: \$660,707

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Lake County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2015 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 is improved with a two-story dwelling of wood exterior construction with 6,325 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 2004. Features of the home include a basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a 966 square foot garage. The property has a 48,399 square foot site and is located in Highland Park, Moraine Township, Lake County.

The appellant contends assessment inequity as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted information on three equity comparables located within .67 of a mile from the subject property. The comparables had features with varying degrees of similarity when compared to the subject. The comparables were improved with two-story dwellings that ranged in size from 4,975 to 6,445 square feet of living area and have improvement assessments ranging from \$294,151 to \$436,308 or from \$52.56 to \$67.70 per

square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested the total assessment be reduced to \$574,386.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$660,707. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$465,125 or \$73.54 per square foot of living area. In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four equity comparables located within .76 of a mile from the subject property. The comparables had features with varying degrees of similarity when compared to the subject. The comparables were improved with two-story dwellings that ranged in size from 6,058 to 7,443 square feet of living area and have improvement assessments ranging from \$457,123 to \$521,837 or from \$70.08 to \$75.46 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

In written rebuttal, counsel for the appellant submitted a brief critiquing the board of review's submission.

Conclusion of Law

The taxpayer 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 and lack of distinguishing characteristics of the assessment comparables to the subject property. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(b). The Board finds the appellant did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The parties submitted information on a total of seven suggested equity comparables for the Board's consideration. The Board gave less weight to the appellant's comparables #1 and #2 and the board of review's comparable #3 due to their larger or smaller dwelling size when compared to the subject property. The Board finds the appellant's comparable #3 and the board of review's comparables #1, #2 and #4 are similar when compared to the subject in location, age, dwelling size, design and features. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$67.70 to \$75.46 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$73.54 per square foot of living area falls within 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.

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.