

# FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Miljan Ivezic
DOCKET NO.: 22-50231.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 10-07-304-033-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Miljan Ivezic, the appellant, by attorney Abby L. Strauss, of Schiller Law P.C., 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:** \$8,905 **IMPR.:** \$27,889 **TOTAL:** \$36,794

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 one-story dwelling of frame exterior construction with 1,332 square feet of living area and which is approximately 94 years old. Features include a full basement, 2½ bathrooms, and central air conditioning. The property has a 6,850 square foot site and is located in Glenview, Niles Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-03 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant contends assessment inequity concerning the improvement as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted information on six equity comparables located in the same neighborhood code as the subject and from .71 to .93 of a mile from the subject. The comparables consist of class 2-03 one-story or "five-story" dwellings of

frame exterior construction which range in age from 67 to 81 years old. The dwellings range in size from 1,300 to 1,326 square feet of living area. Three comparables have full or partial basements and three comparables have either slab or crawl-space foundations. Two homes have central air conditioning, and each home has 1, 1 ½ or 2 bathrooms, while comparable #2 also has a fireplace. Each comparable has a 1-car, 1.5-car or 2-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$18,353 to \$24,030 or from \$13.84 to \$18.48 per square foot of living area.

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduced improvement assessment of \$21,365 or \$16.04 per square foot of living area.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal." The appellant submitted a copy of the final decision disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$36,794. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$27,889 or \$20.94 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 subarea or ¼ of a mile from the subject. The comparables consist of class 2-03 1-story or 1.5-story dwellings of frame, masonry, or frame and masonry exterior construction which range in age from 71 to 97 years old. The dwellings range in size from 1,184 to 1,332 square feet of living area. The comparables have full or partial basements, 1 or 2 full bathrooms, and three homes each have central air conditioning. Comparable #1 has a fireplace, and three comparables each have a two-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$26,331 to \$44,956 or from \$22.24 to \$36.17 per square foot of living area.

Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

In rebuttal, the appellant outlined differences in age or exterior construction as to the board of review comparables when compared to the subject.

#### **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.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The appellant included exterior photographs of the comparables, none of which appear to be five-story designs. As each comparable is reportedly a class 2-03 property which by definition is a one-story dwelling, the Board will analyze the data in light of the classification code.

The parties submitted a total of ten suggested equity comparables to support their respective positions before the Property Tax Appeal Board. The Board has given reduced weight to appellant's comparables #1, #2 and #4, due to differences in foundation type as these homes have crawl-space or slab foundations as compared to the subject's full basement. As argued by the appellant, the Board has also given reduced weight to appellant's comparables #3, #5 and #6 as well as board of review comparable #1, as each of these dwellings are either 67, 70 or 71 years old as compared to the 94 year old subject.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity in the record consists of board of review comparables #2, #3 and #4, which are similar to the subject in classification, age being 93 to 97 years old, foundation type, and some features. The Board finds two comparables necessitate adjustments for differences in dwelling size, and each comparable is inferior to the subject in bathroom count suggesting upward adjustments would be appropriate. Board of review comparable #3 needs an upward adjustment for lack of central air conditioning amenity when compared to the subject. Each of these comparables necessitate downwards adjustments for garage features, which is not an amenity of the subject. These best comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$26,331 to \$35,876 or from \$22.24 to \$29.72 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$27,889 or \$20.94 per square foot of living area is within the range of the best comparables in the record in terms of overall improvement assessment and below the range on a per-square-foot of living area basis. Additionally, but for the garage feature, board of review comparable #4 is nearly identical to the subject in several characteristics but has both a higher overall improvement assessment and a per square foot improvement assessment, when compared to the subject.

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 from the subject to make the comparables more similar to 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 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.

2	1. Fer
	Chairman
a de R	Robert Stoffen
Member	Member
Dan De Kinin	Swah Bokley
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.

October 21, 2025
1111216
Child Park Table 1

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 <u>PETITION AND EVIDENCE</u> 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**

Miljan Ivezic, by attorney: Abby L. Strauss Schiller Law P.C. 33 North Dearborn Suite 1130 Chicago, IL 60602

# **COUNTY**

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