FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION
ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Michael Staab
DOCKET NO.: 22-27608.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 05-17-404-033-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Michael Staab, 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:	$58,650
IMPR.:	$154,349
TOTAL:	$212,999

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 is improved with a 2-story dwelling of stucco exterior construction with 4,982 square feet of living area.[1] The dwelling was constructed in 1978, is approximately 44 years old. Features of the home include a full basement with finished area, four full bathrooms, two half bathrooms, central air conditioning, three fireplaces and a 2-car garage. The property has an approximately 17,773 square foot site located in Winnetka, New Trier Township, Cook County.

The appellant contends both overvaluation and assessment inequity with respect to the improvement as the bases of the appeal. In support of the overvaluation argument the appellant

[1] The appellant, the appellant's appraiser and the board of review differ as to the description of the subject. The Board finds the best description of the subject was found in the appraisal report provided by the appellant which presented a detailed sketch of the subject, as well as interior and exterior photographs of the subject property.

submitted an appraisal estimating the subject property had a market value of $1,725,000 as of July 9, 2021. The appraisal was prepared by Gary Masarsky, a certified residential real estate appraiser. The purpose of the appraisal was to estimate the market value of the subject property for a refinance transaction. The property rights appraised were the fee simple interest. The client was identified as JPMorgan Chase.

The appraiser disclosed the subject's kitchen and bathrooms were remodeled within the previous five years. The appraiser described the improvements to be in overall good condition and "good+" level of modernization. The home was gut rehabbed in 2013. The appraiser determined the subject dwelling has a 10 year old effective age.

In estimating the market value, the appraiser developed the cost approach to value and the sales comparison approach to value. Using the cost approach, the appraiser estimated the subject property had a site value of $500,000. The appraiser estimated the dwelling and improvements has a replacement cost new of $1,417,890. Using a remaining economic life of 65 years, the appraiser calculated physical depreciation to be $189,052. The appraiser estimated the "As-is" value of site improvements to be $25,000. Adding the land value, the depreciated improvement value and the value of the "As-is" site improvements, the appraiser arrived at an estimated market value under the cost approach to value of $1,753,800.

The appellant's appraiser used four comparable sales and two active listings in developing the sales comparison approach to value. The comparables are located in Winnetka and from .03 to .85 of a mile from the subject property. These properties have sites that range in size from 14,529 to 23,920 square feet of land area. The comparables are improved with 2-story or 2.5-story dwellings that range in size from 3,759 to 5,306 square feet of living area and in age from 42 to 108 years old. Each comparable has a basement with finished area, three to five full bathrooms, central air conditioning, from one to three fireplaces and a 2-car garage. Five comparables each have an additional half bathroom. The appraiser indicated in the sales comparison grid the upgrades/modernization of five of the six comparables to be "good," while comparable #5 was reported to be "superior" when compared to the subject's "good" upgrades/modernization. Comparables #1 through #4 were reported to have sold from August 2020 to June 2021 for prices ranging from $1,498,000 to $1,725,000 or from $368.27 to $411.24 per square foot of living area, including land. Comparables #5 and #6 were active listings with prices of $2,175,000 and $2,295,000 or $409.91 and $449.56 per square foot of living area, including land. The appraiser made adjustments to the comparables for differences from the subject in site size, bathroom count, gross living area and other features, as well as differences in upgrades/modernization to arrive at adjusted prices ranging from $1,690,900 to $2,060,000. The appraiser stated that site adjustments were based on contributory value of larger lots. The appraiser also stated that due to updates and improvements to the subject and all comparables over the years, they were considered to be similar in effective age and had not required age adjustments. Based on the adjusted prices the appraiser arrived at an estimated market value under the sales comparison approach to value of $1,725,000.

In reconciling the two approaches to value the appraiser gave most weight to the sales comparison approach to value to arrive at an estimated market value for the subject of $1,725,000 as of July 9, 2021.

With respect to the inequity argument, the appellant submitted information on four equity comparables that have the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject and are located from 350 meters to 1.38 miles from the subject property. The comparables are improved with 2-story dwellings of frame and masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 5,009 to 6,359 square feet of living area. The dwellings are from 34 to 94 years old. Each comparable has a partial basement, from three to five full bathrooms, one additional half bathroom, central air conditioning, from one to four fireplaces and either a 2-car, a 3-car or a 3.5-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments that range from $98,925 to $168,005 or from $19.75 to $26.42 per square foot of living area.

The appellant requested the subject's total assessment be reduced to $190,653, which would reflect a market value of $1,906,530 or $382.68 per square foot of living area, including land, The appellant requested a reduced improvement assessment of $132,002 or $26.50 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 $212,999. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of $2,129,990 or $427.54 per square foot of living area, land included, when using 4,982 square feet, when applying the level of assessment for class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance of 10%. The subject has an improvement assessment of $154,349 or $30.98 per square foot of living area.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales that are located in a subarea of the subject, one of which has the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject. Comparable #1 is located in Glencoe and three comparables are located in Winnetka. The comparables have sites that range in size from 12,525 to 24,704 square feet of land area. The comparables are improved with 2-story dwellings of masonry, frame or frame and masonry exterior construction that range in size from 4,440 to 5,584 square feet of living area. The dwellings are 10 or 31 years old. The comparables each have a full or partial basement, three with finished area. Each comparable has from three to five full bathrooms, one or two half bathrooms, central air conditioning, from one to five fireplaces and either a 2.5-car or a 3-car garage. These properties sold from July 2021 to December 2022 for prices ranging from $2,262,500 to $3,800,000 or from $449.72 to $790.68 per square foot of living area, including land. The comparables have improvement assessments that range from $131,423 to $295,184 or from $27.38 to $61.42 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 appellant contends, in part, that the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in its assessed valuation. When market value is the basis of the appeal the value of the property must be proved by a preponderance of the evidence. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). Proof of market value may consist of an appraisal of the subject property, a recent sale, comparable sales or construction costs. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(c). The Board finds the appellant did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The appellant submitted an appraisal for the subject property and the board of review submitted four comparable sales to support their respective positions before the Property Tax Appeal Board.

The Board has given less weight to the conclusion of value contained in the appellant's appraisal report. The Board finds the appraiser utilized comparable sale #3 that sold in August 2020, 16 months prior to the subject's January 1, 2022 assessment date and is thus less likely to be reflective of market value. The appraiser also chose three comparables that are substantially smaller in dwelling size, when compared to the subject. Additionally, four comparables have dwellings that are significantly older than the subject. Lastly, the appraisal contained a discrepancy in the appraiser's description of the subject dwelling's upgrades/modernization. The appraiser stated on page one of the report that the subject dwelling has "good+" upgrades/modernization but the appraiser stated in the sales comparison grid that the subject dwelling has "good" upgrades/modernization, which calls into question whether or not all the comparables should have adjustments for differences in upgrades/modernization. These factors undermine the appraiser's final conclusion of value.

The Board has given reduced weight to board of review comparables #1 and #2 due to differences from the subject in age and/or they are located in a different village.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be board of review comparables #3 and #4, which sold proximate to the January 1, 2022 assessment date and are located relatively close in proximity to the subject property. The comparables are overall more similar to the subject in dwelling size, design and age. However, the Board finds each comparable has a larger site size and each dwelling has varying degrees of similarity when compared to the subject in bathroom count, basement finish, fireplace count and garage capacity, suggesting adjustments would be required to make the comparables more equivalent to the subject. Nevertheless, these two comparables sold in July 2021 and December 2022 for prices of $2,262,500 and $2,511,250 or for $449.72 and $471.35 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of $2,129,990 or $427.54 per square foot of living area, including land, which falls below the two best comparable sales in the record both. After considering adjustments to the best comparables for differences from the subject, the Board finds the subject's estimated market value as reflected by its assessment is supported and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not justified for overvaluation.

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). 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 information on eight equity comparables for the Board's consideration. The Board has given less weight to the appellant's comparables #1, #2 and #3, as well as board of review comparables #1 and #2 due to differences from the subject in age and/or dwelling size. Additionally, board of review comparable #1 is located in a different village than the subject.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be the appellant's comparable #4, along with board of comparables #3 and #4, which are relatively similar to the subject in location, dwelling size, design, age and some features. These three comparables have improvement assessments that range from $98,925 to $189,651 or from $19.75 to $33.96 per square foot of living area. The subject property's improvement assessment of $154,349 or $30.98 per square foot of living area falls within the range established by the comparables in the record. After considering adjustments to the comparables for differences from the subject, 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 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:

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

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: September 15, 2026

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

Michael Staab, 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