



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

APPELLANT: Christine Michael
DOCKET NO.: 18-24206.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 05-29-409-019-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Christine Michael, 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: \$22,550
IMPR.: \$134,427
TOTAL: \$156,977

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 2018 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 4,789 square feet of living area. The dwelling is approximately 18 years old. Features of the home include a full unfinished basement, central air conditioning,¹ two fireplaces, and a 3-car garage. The property has a 15,552 square foot site and is located in Wilmette, New Trier Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-08 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 eight equity

¹ The appellant reports "1" for central air conditioning in the grid analysis for the subject and each of the comparables. The Board has determined "1" signifies "Yes" for central air conditioning based upon the description of the subject property provided by the board of review.

comparables that are located within the same neighborhood code as the subject. The comparables are improved with two-story dwellings of frame, masonry, or frame and masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 4,123 to 4,867 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 21 to 58 years old. Each comparable has a partial or full basement with two having finished area, central air conditioning, from one to four fireplaces, and a garage ranging from a 2-car to a 3.5-car. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$85,717 to \$128,553 or from \$20.79 to \$26.85 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested that the subject's improvement assessment be reduced to \$115,011 or \$24.02 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 \$156,977. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$134,427 or \$28.07 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, two of which are located within the same neighborhood code as the subject. The comparables are improved with two-story dwellings of masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 3,843 to 4,915 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 4 to 21 years old. Each comparable has a partial or full basement with three having finished area, central air conditioning, two or three fireplaces, and a garage ranging from a 2-car to a 3-car. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$118,172 to \$160,671 or from \$30.12 to \$32.69 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 twelve suggested comparables for the Board's consideration. The Board gives less weight to the appellant's comparables #1, #4, #5, #7 and #8 due to these dwellings' considerably older ages ranging from 41 to 58 years old when compared to the 18-year-old of the subject dwelling. The Board also gives less weight to the board of review comparables #1, #3 and #4 due to their different neighborhood code, considerably newer age, and/or smaller dwelling size when compared to the subject property.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be the appellant's comparables #2, #3 and #6 and the board of review comparable #2. These comparables are smaller in dwelling size than the subject and most similar to the subject in location, design, foundation, and other features. These four comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$22.69 to \$31.31 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$28.07 per square foot of living area falls within the range of the best comparables contained in this record. After

considering adjustments to the comparables for differences when compared to the subject, such as their smaller dwelling sizes, 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 exists 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: November 17, 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

Christine Michael, 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