



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

APPELLANT: Richard Pruski  
DOCKET NO.: 15-22001.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 01-13-103-037-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Richard Pruski, the appellant, by attorney Timothy E. Moran, of Schmidt Salzman & Moran, Ltd. 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:** \$9,811  
**IMPR.:** \$106,584  
**TOTAL:** \$116,395

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 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 consists of a two-story dwelling of masonry construction with 8,072 square feet of living area. The dwelling is 10 years old. Features of the home include a full finished basement, central air conditioning, two fireplaces and a four-car garage. The property has a 53,665-square foot site and is located in Inverness, Barrington Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-09 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant contends both land and improvement assessment inequity as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted information on five equity comparables, two of which were located in the same neighborhood code as the subject property. The comparables had lot sizes ranging from 46,347 to 217,800 square feet of land area and land assessments ranging from \$10,541 to \$32,670 or from \$.05 to \$.25 per square foot of land area.

The appellant argued that 18,022 square feet of the subject lot is a retention pond and is unbuildable. The comparables were improved with two-story dwellings that ranged in age from 23 to 74 years old. The comparables had varying degrees of similarity to the subject. The comparables had improvement assessments ranging from \$75,543 to \$94,345 or from \$9.55 to \$12.07 per square foot of living area.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$116,395. The subject property has a land assessment of \$9,811 or \$.18 per square foot of land area and an improvement assessment of \$106,584 or \$13.20 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 that were located in the same neighborhood code as the subject property. The comparables had lot sizes ranging from 42,209 to 61,288 square feet of land area and land assessments ranging from \$10,552 to \$15,322 or \$.25 per square foot of land area. The comparables were improved with two-story dwellings that ranged in age from 9 to 24 years old. The comparables had varying degrees of similarity to the subject. The comparables had improvement assessments ranging from \$106,412 to \$128,283 or from \$13.41 to \$16.38 per square foot of living area.

### **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.

As an initial finding regarding the appellant's argument that the subject's lot has 18,022 square feet of land area that is a retention pond and is unbuildable, the Board finds the appellant failed to disclose whether any of the land comparables submitted had similar retention pond and unbuildable area. Therefore, no meaningful land assessment comparability analysis can be determined based on the argument brought by the appellant that a portion of the subject's lot is a retention pond and is unbuildable.

Nevertheless, the Board finds the best evidence of land assessment equity to be the appellant's comparable #1 and the board of review's comparables. These comparables were located in the same neighborhood code as the subject and had lot sizes similar to the subject. These comparables had land sizes ranging from 42,209 to 61,288 and land assessments ranging from \$10,522 to \$15,322 or \$.25 per square foot of land area. The subject's land assessment of \$9,811 or \$.18 falls below the range established by the best land comparables in this record. The Board gave less weight to the appellant's remaining land comparables due to their differences in lot size, when compared to the subject's lot. Based on this record the Board finds the appellant did not demonstrate with clear and convincing evidence that the subject's land was inequitably assessed and a reduction in the subject's land assessment is not justified.

The Board finds the best evidence of improvement assessment equity to be the board of review's comparables #1, #2 and #3. These comparables were most similar to the subject in style, size, age and features. These comparables had improvement assessments ranging from \$106,412 to \$128,283 or from \$13.41 to \$16.38 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$106,584 or \$13.20 per square foot of living area is supported by the improvement assessments of the best comparables in this record. The Board gave less weight to the parties' remaining comparables due to their difference in age when compared to the subject. 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 improvement assessment is not justified.

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

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. Pursuant to Section 1910.50(b) of the rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(b)) the proceeding before the Property Tax Appeal Board is terminated when the decision is rendered. The Property Tax Appeal Board does not require any motion or request for reconsideration.



Chairman



Member



Member



Member

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 20, 2018



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 or years of the same general assessment period, as provided in Sections 9-125 through 9-225, 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 such subsequent year or years 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 OR YEARS. A separate petition and evidence must be filed for each of the remaining years of the general assessment period.

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.

PARTIES OF RECORD

AGENCY

State of Illinois  
Property Tax Appeal Board  
William G. Stratton Building, Room 402  
401 South Spring Street  
Springfield, IL 62706-4001

APPELLANT

Richard Pruski, by attorney:  
Timothy E. Moran  
Schmidt Salzman & Moran, Ltd.  
111 West Washington Street  
Suite 1300  
Chicago, IL 60602

COUNTY

Cook County Board of Review  
County Building, Room 601  
118 North Clark Street  
Chicago, IL 60602