



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

APPELLANT: Todd Gorrell
DOCKET NO.: 17-20915.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 16-18-112-003-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Todd Gorrell, the appellant, by attorney Michael R. Davies, of Ryan Law LLP 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: \$3,749
IMPR.: \$39,577
TOTAL: \$43,326

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 2017 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 exterior construction with 2,083 square feet of living area. The dwelling is 91 years old. Features of the home includes a full basement, air conditioning¹ and a two-car garage. The property has a 4,166 square foot site and is located in Oak Park, Oak Park Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-05 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 five equity

¹ Appellant included an unidentified property printout of the subject depicting "2" air conditioning units and the board of review reported the subject lacks air conditioning. While only central air conditioning would be an assessable characteristic and not window units, the Board finds this factual discrepancy does not prevent a determination of the subject's assessment on this record.

comparables that are located within the same neighborhood code as the subject property. The comparables are improved with two-story dwellings of frame or stucco exterior construction ranging in size from 1,788 to 2,179 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 97 to 109 years old, have partial or full basements, one of which has finished area. Features of the comparables include "2" air conditioning, and four comparables each have a 2-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$34,669 to \$41,760 or from \$18.17 to \$19.39 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested that the improvement assessment be reduced to \$37,848 or \$18.17 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 \$43,326. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$39,577 or \$19.00 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 two-story dwellings of masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 1,656 to 2,101 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 89 to 105 years old, and have full basements, one of which has a finished area. The comparables have a 1-car, a 1.5-car or a 2-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$34,925 to \$45,505 or from \$20.88 to \$23.48 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested that the subject's 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 nine suggested comparables for the Board's consideration. The Board gives less weight to the appellant's comparable #5 and board of review comparables #1, #3 and #4 based on their considerably smaller dwelling sizes when compared to the size of the subject dwelling. The Board also gives less weight to the appellant's comparable #2 which lacks a garage when compared to the subject's 2-car garage.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be the appellant's comparables #1, #3, and #4 as well as the board of review comparable #2. The Board gives greater weight to these three comparables because they are closer in dwelling size to the subject and are also similar to the subject in location, design, age, foundation, and/or other features. These four comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$37,448 to \$45,505 or from \$18.17 to \$21.66 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$39,577 or \$19.00 per square foot of living area falls within the range established by the best comparables contained in this record. After considering adjustments to the comparables for differences 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. 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(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: October 20, 2020



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

Todd Gorrell, by attorney:
Michael R. Davies
Ryan Law LLP
311 South Wacker Drive
Mailbox #29
Chicago, IL 60606

COUNTY

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