



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

APPELLANT: Karl Dahlstrom  
DOCKET NO.: 16-21872.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 05-17-301-012-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Karl Dahlstrom, the appellant, by attorney Abby L. Strauss, of Schiller Strauss & Lavin PC 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:** \$20,280  
**IMPR.:** \$60,720  
**TOTAL:** \$81,000

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 2016 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 frame exterior construction with 3,000<sup>1</sup> square feet of living area. The dwelling is approximately 99 years old and was reported to have an effective age of 19 years old. Features of the home include a full unfinished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a 2-car garage. The property has an 11,914 square foot site and is located in Winnetka, New Trier Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-06 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

---

<sup>1</sup> The appellant's appraisal reported 3,000 square feet of living area, although the assessing officials reported 2,348 square feet of living area. The Board finds the discrepancy does not prohibit making a determination of the correct assessment but also finds the appraiser inspected the subject property.

When completing Section 2d of the appeal form, the appellant indicated that the appeal was based on contention of law, however, the appellant submitted a recent appraisal. As a result, the Board will consider overvaluation to be the basis of this appeal.

In support of this argument the appellant submitted an appraisal estimating the subject property had a market value of \$675,000 as of January 1, 2016. The appraisal was prepared by Audrey Clamage, a certified residential real estate appraiser. In estimating the market value of the subject property, the appraiser developed the sales comparison approach and cost approach to value.

Under the sales comparison approach, the appraiser analyzed four comparable sales located from .07 to 1.87 miles from the subject property. The comparables consist of one, 1-story<sup>2</sup> and three, 2-story dwellings that range in age from 55 to 99 years old. The comparable sales were reported to have effective ages of 20 years old. The dwellings have full basements, two of which have finished area, fireplaces and 2-car garages. Three comparables have central air conditioning. The dwellings range in size from 2,124 to 3,558 square feet of living area and are situated on sites ranging in size from 7,950 to 22,983 square feet of land area. The comparables sold from June to November 2015 for prices ranging from \$650,000 to \$850,000 or from \$230.01 to \$339.92 per square foot of living area including land. The appraiser made adjustments to each comparable for differences from the subject property to arrive at adjusted prices ranging from \$646,960 to \$817,680.

In estimating the cost approach to value, the appraiser estimated the subject's land value at \$80,000. The appraiser then calculated a replacement cost of \$688,200. The appraiser estimated physical depreciation of \$33,242 for a depreciated improvement value of \$654,958. The land was added back to arrive at an estimate of value for the subject property under the cost approach of \$735,000.

The appraiser submitted photographs of the subject's exterior depicting chipped and peeling paint and worn concrete and cracked patio. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested the total assessment be reduced to \$67,500 which would reflect the appraised value.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$81,000. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$810,000 or \$270.00 per square foot of living area, land included, when using 3000 square feet of land area and when using the level of assessments for class 2 property of 10% under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted information on eight comparable sales located within the same neighborhood assessment code as the subject property. The comparables consist of 2-story dwellings that range in age from 91 to 113 years old. The dwellings have partial or full basements and from 1-car to 3-car garages. Three comparables have central air conditioning; seven comparables have fireplaces. The dwellings range in size from 2,322 to 3,178 square feet of living area and are situated on sites ranging in size from 7,500 to 14,800 square feet of land area. The comparables sold from February to August 2015 for

---

<sup>2</sup> Photographic evidence supplied by the appraiser appears to depict a 1-story dwelling for comparable sale #4.

prices ranging from \$950,000 to \$1,420,000 or from \$389.23 to \$540.44 per square foot of living area including land. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

In written rebuttal, counsel for the appellant critiqued the board of review's submission noting the sales presented have not been adjusted for differences from the subject property.

### **Conclusion of Law**

The appellant 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 record contains an appraisal submitted by the appellant and eight comparable sales provided by the board of review. The Board finds the appellant's appraisal is unpersuasive and not a credible indicator of value. The Board finds the appellant's appraisal utilized comparables that were different in age, design and location when more similar sales were available. Comparables #1, #3 and #4 were distant in location. Comparable #4 also had a newer age, dissimilar dwelling design and larger lot size. These factors, some of which were not adjusted for, undermine the appraiser's final opinion of value. Therefore, the Board gives less weight to the conclusion of value contained in the appellant's appraisal.

The Board gave less weight to board of review sale comparables #5 through #8 due to their smaller dwelling sizes when compared to the subject property. The Board finds the four remaining board of review's comparable sales sold proximate in time to the January 1, 2016 assessment date and are more similar when compared to the subject in location, age, dwelling size, design and/or most features. These comparables sold from May to July 2015 for prices ranging from \$1,134,996 to \$1,420,000 or from \$389.23 to \$457.77 per square foot of living area including land. The subject's assessment reflects an estimated market value of \$810,000 or \$270.00 per square foot of living area including land, which falls below the range established by the most similar comparable sales contained in the record. Based on this evidence the Board finds the subject is not overvalued and a reduction in the 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. Pursuant to Section 1910.50(d) of the rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(d)) 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: June 18, 2019



\_\_\_\_\_  
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

Karl Dahlstrom, by attorney:  
Abby L. Strauss  
Schiller Strauss & Lavin PC  
33 North Dearborn  
Suite 650  
Chicago, IL 60602

COUNTY

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