



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

APPELLANT: Abbey Ogunbola
DOCKET NO.: 22-25336.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 10-13-426-004-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Abbey Ogunbola, the appellant, by attorney Robert Rosenfeld, of Robert H. Rosenfeld & Associates, LLC in Northbrook; 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: \$5,967
IMPR.: \$48,027
TOTAL: \$53,994

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 2022 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 2-story dwelling of masonry exterior construction with 2,287 square feet of living area that is approximately 94 years old. The features of the subject include 3½ baths, a full unfinished basement, central air conditioning, one fireplace, and a 2-car garage. The property has a 4,590 square foot site and is located in Evanston, Evanston Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-06 property¹ 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 four equity comparables located from .4 to .9 of a mile from the subject, and within the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject property. The comparables consist of 2-story, class 2-06

¹ Two-or-more story residence, over 62 years of age, containing from 2,201 to 4,999 square feet of living area.

dwellings of masonry or frame and masonry construction ranging in size from 2,324 to 2,959 square feet of living area and ranging in age from 67 to 71 years old. Each comparable features from 2 to 3½ baths and central air conditioning. Two comparables have a crawl space foundation, and two have a full basement, however it was not disclosed whether the basements have a finished area. Three comparables each have a fireplace, and three have a 2-car, a 2.5-car, or a 3-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments that range from \$30,950 to \$42,950 or from \$12.08 to \$15.24 per square foot of living area. The appellant's counsel also submitted a brief requesting a reduction to the subject's improvement assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$53,994. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$48,027 or \$21.00 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 located within ¼ of a mile from the subject and in the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject property. The comparables consist of 2-story, class 2-06 dwellings of frame construction ranging in size from 2,344 to 2,678 square feet of living area and ranging in age from 101 to 124 years old. The comparables each feature from two to three baths, a full or partial basement (two of which are each finished with a formal recreation room), and a 2-car, a 2.5-car, or a 3-car garage. Three comparables have central air conditioning, and one comparable has a fireplace. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$52,715 to \$66,448 or from \$22.14 to \$25.98 per square foot of living area.

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 in support of their positions before the Property Tax Appeal Board. The Board gave less weight to appellant's comparables due to comparables #1 and #4 each having a crawl space foundation, dissimilar to the subject's basement, and comparables #2 and #3 lack information with regard to their basement finishes making a meaningful comparative analysis with the subject property less reliable. Additionally, appellant's comparable #1 lacks a garage which is a feature of the subject property, and comparable #3 is significantly larger in dwelling size relative to the subject dwelling. Finally, the Board gave less weight to board of review comparables #2 and #4 based on their finished basements, dissimilar from the subject's unfinished basement.

The Board finds the best evidence of equity in assessment to be board of review comparables #1 and #3 which are overall most similar to the subject in location, age, unfinished basements, and some features. However, each of these comparables has a somewhat larger dwelling size suggesting that downward adjustments are needed to the comparables for these difference in

order to make them more equivalent to the subject. The best comparables in this record have improvement assessments of \$57,265 and \$64,687 or \$22.14 and \$24.15 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$48,027 or \$21.00 per square foot of living area is lower than the two best equity comparables in this record which is logical given the subject's somewhat smaller dwelling size.

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.

After considering adjustments to the comparables in this record for differences from the subject, the Board finds that the appellant did not establish by clear and convincing evidence that the subject's improvement is inequitably assessed and, therefore, a reduction in the subject's improvement assessment is not 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

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: _____

July 15, 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

Abbey Ogunbola, by attorney:
Robert Rosenfeld
Robert H. Rosenfeld & Associates, LLC
40 Skokie Blvd
Suite 150
Northbrook, IL 60062

COUNTY

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