



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

APPELLANT: Don Bogdanovski
DOCKET NO.: 20-26840.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 03-30-416-023-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Don Bogdanovski, the appellant, by Amy C. Floyd, Attorney at Law, 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: \$4,173
IMPR.: \$25,499
TOTAL: \$29,672

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 2020 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 frame and masonry exterior construction with 1,415 square feet of living area. The dwelling is approximately 59 years old. Features include a partial basement with a formal recreation room, 2 bathrooms, central air conditioning, a fireplace, and a two-car garage. The property has a 6,678 square foot site and is located in Arlington Heights, Wheeling 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 concerning the improvement assessment as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted information on four equity comparables located in the same assigned neighborhood code as the subject. The comparables consist of class 2-34 multi-level dwellings of frame or frame and masonry exterior construction that range in age from 53 to 64 years old. The dwellings range in size from 998 to 2,365 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a partial basement with a formal recreation room and

1½ to 2½ bathrooms. Three homes each have central air conditioning and comparable #1 has a fireplace. The appellant provided no data concerning garages and the photographs supplied with the appeal fail to clearly depict garage amenities for each property. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$13,183 to \$25,947 or from \$10.97 to \$16.97 per square foot of living area.

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduced improvement assessment of \$20,716 or \$14.64 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 \$29,672. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$25,499 or \$18.02 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 located in the same neighborhood code as the subject and either the subarea, same block or within ¼ of a mile from the subject. The comparables consist of class 2-34 multi-level dwellings of frame and masonry exterior construction that range in age from 55 to 63 years old. The dwellings range in size from 1,089 to 1,566 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a partial basement with a formal recreation room, 1 to 2½ bathrooms, and either a one-car or a two-car garage. Two comparables each have a fireplace. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$20,528 to \$29,268 or from \$18.57 to \$18.98 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 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 a total of eight equity comparables to support their respective positions before the Property Tax Appeal Board. The Board has given reduced weight to the appellant's comparables #1, #2 and #3 as well as board of review comparables #2 and #3, which differ in size from approximately 10% and 71% when compared to the subject.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be appellant's comparable #4 along with board of review comparables #1 and #4, which present varying degrees of similarity to the subject. A downward adjustment appears necessary to appellant's comparable #4 while an upward adjustment is necessary to board of review comparable #4 as each property differs from the subject in bathroom count. Board of review comparable #4 also needs upward adjustments for lack of air conditioning and fireplace, both of which are features of the subject. Finally, an

upward adjustment may be necessary for garage amenity to appellant's comparable #4 as the record fails to clearly identify the garage amenity, if any. These comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$23,932 to \$25,443 or from \$16.97 to \$18.98 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$25,499 or \$18.02 per square foot of living area falls somewhat above the range established by the best comparables in this record in terms of overall improvement assessment and within the range on a per-square-foot of living area basis which appears to be logical given the adjustments necessary to the comparables.

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 taxation 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.

Based on this record and after considering appropriate adjustments to the best comparables for differences when compared to the subject property, 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.

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

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: March 18, 2025

Clerk of the Property Tax Appeal Board

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

Don Bogdanovski, by attorney:
Amy C. Floyd
Attorney at Law
57 E. Delaware
#3101
Chicago, IL 60611

COUNTY

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