



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

APPELLANT: Todd Sippel
DOCKET NO.: 17-41243.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 17-06-419-019-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Todd Sippel, the appellant(s), by attorney Noah J. Schmidt, 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: \$9,750
IMPR.: \$74,842
TOTAL: \$84,592

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 16-185 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-185) 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 3,250 square foot parcel of land improved with two improvements. The improvements are 117-years old. Improvement #1 is a three-story, masonry, multi-family dwelling containing 3,290 square feet of building area. Improvement #2 is a one-story, masonry, single-family dwelling containing 623 square feet of building area. The property is located in Chicago, West Township, Cook County and is classified as a class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant contends inequity and contention of law as the bases of the appeal. In support of the equity argument, the appellant submitted five comparables for each improvement.

For improvement #1, the properties are described as two or three-story, masonry, multi-family dwellings. They range: in age from 109 to 120 years; in size from 3,020 to 3,344 square feet of

building area; and in improvement assessment from \$14.00 to \$16.24 per square foot of building area.

For improvement #2, the properties are described as one-story, masonry or frame, single-family dwellings. They range: in age from 117 to 137 years; in size from 500 to 640 square feet of building area; and in improvement assessment from \$14.83 to \$19.39 per square foot of building area.

In support of the contention of law the appellant's brief states that in 2015 the Board reduced the assessment and that "[s]ince the time of this reduction, there have been no capital improvements made to the property which would materially increase the market value thereof." The appellant did not submit any evidence as to the occupancy of the subject. The appellant included the 2015 decision.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the subject's total assessment of \$84,592. Improvement #1 has an allocated improvement assessment of \$54,476 or \$16.56 per square foot of building area while improvement #2 has an allocated improvement assessment of \$20,366 or \$32.69 per square foot of building area.

In support of the assessment the board of review submitted four equity comparables for improvement #1. The properties are described as three-story, masonry, multi-family dwellings. They range: in age from 113 to 127 years; in size from 2,258 to 2,880 square feet of building area; and in improvement assessment from \$16.95 to \$18.91 per square foot of building area.

For improvement #2, the board of review submitted three comparables. These properties are described as one or one-story, masonry, single-family dwellings. They range: in age from 125 to 137 years; in size from 600 to 925 square feet of building area; and in improvement assessment from \$29.35 to \$45.65 per square foot of building area.

Conclusion of Law

The appellant raised contention of law argument as established by the Property Tax Appeal Board section 16-185 of the Property Tax Code. (35 ILCS 200/16-185). When a contention of law is raised the burden of proof is a preponderance of the evidence. (See 5 ILCS 100/10-15).

Section 16-185 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-185) states in part:

If the Property Tax Appeal Board renders a decision lowering the assessment of a particular parcel on which a residence occupied by the owner is situated, such reduced assessment, subject to equalization, shall remain in effect for the remainder of the general assessment period as provided in Sections 9-215 through 9-225, unless that parcel is subsequently sold in an arm's length transaction establishing a fair cash value for the parcel that is different from the fair cash value on which the Board's assessment is based, or unless the decision of the Property Tax Appeal Board is reversed or modified upon review.

The Property Tax Appeal Board finds the brief submitted by the appellant specifically addresses any changes in ownership to the subject, but fails to establish that the subject is an owner-occupied residence. This failure calls into question the occupancy of the subject. In addition, the 2016 appeal was decided based on equity and ruled that the “rollover” provision did not apply. Therefore, the Board finds this statute does not apply in the instant appeal and the assessment cannot be automatically applied to the 2017 lien year.

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).

As to improvement #1, the Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be the appellant’s comparables #2 and #5 and the board of review’s comparables. These comparables had improvement assessments ranging from \$15.03 to \$18.91 per square foot of building area. The remaining comparables were given diminished weight for differences in design. The subject's improvement assessment of \$16.56 per square foot of building area is within the range of the best comparables in this record. 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 #1 assessment is not justified.

As to improvement #2, the Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be the appellant’s comparables #1 and #5 and the board of review’s comparables #2 and #3. These comparables had improvement assessments ranging from \$14.83 to \$45.65 per square foot of building area. The remaining comparables were given diminished weight for differences in construction or size. The subject's improvement assessment of \$32.69 per square foot of building area is within the range of the best comparables in this record. 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 #2 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: October 19, 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

Todd Sippel, by attorney:
Noah J. Schmidt
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