



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

APPELLANT: Locke Bowman
DOCKET NO.: 22-25341.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 11-19-208-034-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Locke Bowman, the appellant, by attorney Jeremy 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: \$12,495
IMPR.: \$68,642
TOTAL: \$81,137

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 two-story row house/townhouse of frame exterior construction with 2,607 square feet of living area. The dwelling is approximately 123 years old. Features include a full basement, 3½ bathrooms, a fireplace, and a one-car garage. The property has a 4,910 square foot site and is located in Evanston, Evanston Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-10 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.¹

The appellant contends assessment inequity concerning the improvement as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted information on four equity comparables located in the same neighborhood code as the subject and either .02 or .03 of a mile from the subject. The comparables consist of class 2-10 two-story row house/townhouses of

¹ Class 2-10 is defined as "Old style row house (townhome), over 62 years of age."

frame exterior construction. The dwellings are either 123 or 124 years old and range in size from 2,895 to 3,098 square feet of living area. Features include full basements, 2 full bathrooms and three comparables each have 1 or 2 half-baths, and a one-car or a two-car garage. Three comparables each have two or three fireplaces. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$69,500 to \$75,000 or from \$22.43 to \$25.91 per square foot of living area.

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduced improvement assessment of \$63,142 or \$24.22 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 \$81,137. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$68,642 or \$26.33 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 the same block or ¼ of a mile from the subject. The comparables consist of class 2-10 two-story row house/townhouses of frame exterior construction that are 119 to 129 years old. The homes range in size from 2,358 to 2,607 square feet of living area. The comparables have full basements, 2 or 3½ bathrooms, one or two fireplaces, and three comparables each have a two-car garage. Two comparables each have central air conditioning. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$70,493 to \$80,500 or from \$28.45 to \$32.49 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 on this record.

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, despite their proximity to the subject, each of these comparables is from approximately 11% to over 18% larger than the subject dwelling. The Board has given reduced weight to board of review comparables #1 and #2, due to air conditioning amenity which is not a feature of the subject.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity in the record to be board of review comparables #3 and #4, which bracket subject in age and are similar to the subject in design, exterior construction, foundation type, and some features. One comparable is inferior in bathroom count suggesting upward adjustments to this property would be appropriate but is also

superior to the subject in garage capacity indicating a downward adjustment for this difference. One comparable is identical to the subject in dwelling size but lacks a garage indicating an upward adjustment would be necessary to make the property more similar to the subject for this feature. The Board finds these comparables have improvement assessments of \$70,493 and \$76,500 or of \$28.45 and \$29.34 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$68,642 or \$26.33 per square foot of living area is below these best comparables both in terms of overall improvement assessment and on a per-square-foot of living area basis.

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

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: June 17, 2025



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

Locke Bowman, by attorney:
Jeremy 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