

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

| APPELLANT: | Allen Bonney |
|-------------|--------------------|
| DOCKET NO.: | 16-38841.001-R-1 |
| PARCEL NO.: | 10-14-214-045-0000 |

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Allen Bonney, the appellant, by attorney Robert Rosenfeld, of Robert H. Rosenfeld and Associates, LLC 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 <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: | \$6,264 |
|--------|----------|
| IMPR.: | \$28,260 |
| TOTAL: | \$34,524 |

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 multi-level dwelling of masonry exterior construction with 1,577 square feet of living area. The dwelling is 59 years old. Features of the dwelling include a partial basement with finished area and a two-car garage. The property has an 8,641 square foot site and is located in Evanston, Niles Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-34 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant contends assessment inequity with respect to the improvement as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted information on three equity comparables that are located within the same neighborhood code as the subject property. The comparables are improved with class 2-34, multi-level dwellings of masonry or frame and masonry exterior construction that range in size from 1,222 to 1,458 square feet of living area. The dwellings are 53 or 61 years old, have partial basements with finished area, and central air

conditioning. One comparable has a 1-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$2,312 to \$6,777 or from \$3.78 to \$9.68 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested that the improvement assessment be reduced to \$9,257 or \$5.87 per square foot of living area. As part of the submission, the Board recognizes the appellant's grid analysis reports two parcel index numbers (PINs) for each of the appellant's comparables, but they did not disclose the individual land and improvement assessments for the parcels.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$34,524. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$28,260 or \$17.92 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 are located within the same neighborhood code as the subject property. The comparables are improved with class 2-34, multi-level dwellings of masonry or frame and masonry exterior construction that range in size from 1,275 to 1,984 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 48 to 58 years old, have partial basements with finished area, and central air conditioning. Three of the comparables have either a 2-car or a 2.5-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$26,515 to \$35,741 or from \$18.01 to \$24.50 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested that the assessment be confirmed.

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 seven suggested comparables for the Board's consideration. The Board gives less weight to the appellant's comparables because the appellant's evidence reports two PINs for their comparables, and they appear to be an outlier without an explanation for their significantly lower total improvement assessment in comparison to the other comparables. The Board also gives less weight to the board of review comparable #4 due to its significantly larger dwelling size when compared to the subject's dwelling size.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be the board of review comparables #1 through #3. These comparables are most similar to the subject in location, design, exterior construction, age, dwelling size, foundation, and some features. These comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$26,515 to \$35,741 or from \$18.73 to \$24.50 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$28,260 or \$17.92 per square foot of living area falls within the range established by the most similar comparables contained in this record with its improvement assessment and below the range on a per-square-foot basis. After considering adjustments to the comparables when compared to the subject, 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 constitutional provision for uniformity of taxation and valuation does not require mathematical equality. A practical uniformity, rather than an absolute one, is the test. <u>Apex</u> <u>Motor Fuel Co. v. Barrett</u>, 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(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.

21. Fer

| Cha | irman |
|-------------|---------------|
| CAR | dover Staffer |
| Member | Member |
| Dan Dikinin | Sarah Bokley |
| 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:

April 21, 2020

Mano Alorios

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 <u>PETITION AND</u> <u>EVIDENCE</u> 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

Allen Bonney, by attorney: Robert Rosenfeld Robert H. Rosenfeld and Associates, LLC 33 North Dearborn Street Suite 1850 Chicago, IL 60602

COUNTY

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