



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

APPELLANT: Karatoola Series LLC
DOCKET NO.: 17-33895.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 24-10-117-021-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Karatoola Series LLC, the appellant, by attorney George N. Reveliotis, of Reveliotis Law, P.C. in Park Ridge; 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: \$4,233
IMPR.: \$22,157
TOTAL: \$26,390

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 one-story dwelling of masonry exterior construction with 1,626 square feet of living area. The dwelling is approximately 40 years old. Features of the home include a partial basement with finished area, central air conditioning and a two-car garage. The property has a 7,056 square foot site and is located in Oak Lawn, Worth Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-03 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance

The appellant contends overvaluation and assessment inequity as the bases of the appeal. The appellant's land assessment was not contested. In support of the overvaluation argument the appellant submitted information on four comparable sales located in the same neighborhood code as the subject property. The comparables were improved with similar class 2-03 dwellings of masonry exterior construction that range in size from 1,180 to 1,713 square feet of living area.

The dwellings range in age from 41 to 60 years old. The comparables have sites ranging in size from 6,450 to 7,980 square feet of land area. Each comparable has a full or partial unfinished basement, two comparables have central air conditioning, two comparables have a fireplace and each comparable has a one and one-half-car or a two-car garage. The comparables sold from June 2015 to May 2017 for prices ranging from \$160,000 to \$221,000 or from \$124.34 to \$137.27 per square foot of living area, land included.

In support of the inequity argument the appellant submitted nine equity comparables located in the same neighborhood code and within 0.24 of a mile from the subject property. The comparables were improved with one-story dwellings of masonry or frame and masonry exterior construction that ranged in size from 1,354 to 1,794 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 48 to 60 years old. Eight comparables have either a partial or full basement with five comparables having finished area, each comparable has central air conditioning, four comparables have a fireplace and eight comparables have a two-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$14,568 to \$21,007 or from \$10.25 to \$12.98 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested that the subject's assessment be reduced.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$26,390. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$263,900 or \$162.30 per square foot of living area, including land, when using the level of assessment for class 2 property of 10% under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance. The subject has an improvement assessment of \$22,157 or \$13.63 per square foot of living area.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review disclosed that the subject property sold in December 2017 for a price of \$262,000 or \$161.13 per square foot of living area, land included. The board of review did not provide any evidence to support that the sale had all the elements of an arm's length transaction. The board of review also submitted information on four comparable sales located in the same neighborhood code and within the subarea or one-fourth of a mile from the subject. The comparables are improved with a two-story dwelling, a multi-level dwelling, a one-story dwelling and a one and one-half-story dwelling of masonry or frame and masonry exterior construction that range in size from 1,348 to 1,734 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 48 to 69 years old. The comparables have sites ranging in size from 6,550 to 7,727 square feet of land area. Three comparables have either a partial or full basement with finished area, each comparable has central air conditioning, two comparables have a fireplace and each comparable has either a one and one-half-car or a two-car garage. The comparables sold from January 2016 to June 2017 for prices ranging from \$241,500 to \$327,500 or from \$174.58 to \$205.54 per square foot of living area, land included.

In support of the contention that the subject property is equitably assessed the board of review submitted information on four equity comparables located in the same neighborhood code and within the subarea or one-fourth of a mile from the subject. The comparables are improved with three, one-story dwellings and a two-story dwelling of masonry or frame and masonry exterior construction that range in size from 1,312 to 1,558 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 38 to 57 years old. Each comparable has either a partial or full basement with

two comparables having finished area, each comparable has central air conditioning, two comparables have a fireplace and each comparable has a two-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$17,964 to \$22,585 or from \$13.69 to \$14.50 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

Conclusion of Law

The appellant contends in part that 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 Board gave less weight to the sale of the subject property, as there was no evidence provided to document that the sale was an arm's length transaction.

The parties submitted eight comparable sales for the Board's consideration. The Board gave less weight to the appellant's comparables #1 and #2 along with the board of review comparables #1, #2 and #4 based on their dissimilar dwelling size and/or lack of central air conditioning and/or dissimilar design when compared to the subject. The Board gave less weight to the appellant's comparable #3 as this comparable sold in June 2015, which is dated and less likely to be indicative of fair market value as of the subject's January 1, 2017 assessment date.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be appellant's comparable sale #4 along with the board of review comparable sale #3. These comparables have varying degrees of similarity in site size, dwelling size and some features. These comparables sold for prices of \$190,000 and \$241,500 or \$127.77 and \$179.15 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$263,900 or \$162.30 per square foot of living area, including land, which is between on a per-square-foot basis and above the best comparable sales in this record on a market value basis, which is supported by a larger site size, newer age and larger dwelling size. After considering adjustments to the comparable sales for differences when compared to the subject, the Board finds the subject's estimated market value as reflected by the assessment is supported. Based on this evidence the Board finds no reduction in the subject's assessment is justified.

The taxpayer also 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 thirteen equity comparables for the Board's consideration. The Board gave less weight to the appellant's comparable #4 based on its lack of a basement along with the board of review comparable #3 based on its dissimilar design when compared to the subject property. The Board gave less weight to the appellant's comparables #2, #3 and #8 along with the board of review's comparables #1 and #2 based on a lack of finished basement when compared to the subject.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be appellant's comparables #1, #5, #6, #7 and #9 along with the board of review comparable #4. These comparables have varying degrees of similarity in location, age, dwelling size and features. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$14,568 to \$20,020 or from \$10.25 to \$13.92 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$22,157 or \$13.63 per square foot of living area falls , which is between on a per-square-foot basis and above the best comparable sales in this record on an improvement assessment basis, which is supported by its newer age. 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 constitutional provision for uniformity of taxation and valuation does not require mathematical equality. The requirement is satisfied if the intent is evident to adjust the burden with a reasonable degree of uniformity and if such is the effect of the statute enacted by the General Assembly establishing the method of assessing real property in its general operation. 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 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. For the foregoing reasons, the Board finds that the appellant has not proven by clear and convincing evidence that the subject property is inequitably assessed. Therefore, no reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

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:

April 20, 2021



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

Karatoola Series LLC, by attorney:
George N. Reveliotis
Reveliotis Law, P.C.
1030 Higgins Road
Suite 101
Park Ridge, IL 60068

COUNTY

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