



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

APPELLANT: Joel Schneider  
DOCKET NO.: 23-28198.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 05-28-409-016-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Joel Schneider, the appellant, by attorney George N. Reveliotis of Reveliotis Law, P.C. in Park Ridge; 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:** \$24,241  
**IMPR.:** \$88,460  
**TOTAL:** \$112,701

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 2023 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 dwelling of frame exterior construction with 2,873 square feet of living area. The dwelling is approximately 80 years old. Features of the dwelling include a partial unfinished basement, three full bathrooms, one half bathroom, central air conditioning, two fireplaces and a 2-car garage. The property has an 8,815 square foot site and is located in Wilmette, New Trier Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-06 property 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 six equity comparables that have the same assessment neighborhood code and property classification code as the subject. The comparables are located within .05 of a mile from the subject, three of which are also along the same street as the subject property. The comparables are improved with two-

story dwellings of frame, stucco or frame and masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 2,210 to 3,235 square feet of living area. The dwellings are from 74 to 124 years old. The comparables each have a full or partial basement. No data was provided by the appellant concerning basement finish, if any, for the comparables. Each comparable has two or three full bathrooms, central air conditioning, two fireplaces and either a 1.5-car, a 2-car or a 3.5-car garage. Five comparables each have an additional one or two half bathrooms. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$56,753 to \$83,643 or from \$20.37 to \$29.99 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested the subject's improvement assessment be reduced to \$68,895 or \$23.98 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 \$112,701. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$88,460 or \$30.79 per square foot of living area.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four comparables that have the same assessment neighborhood code and property classification code as the subject. The comparables are located approximately ¼ of a mile from the subject property, one of which is also along the same street as the subject. The comparables are improved with two-story dwellings of frame, masonry or frame and masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 2,623 to 4,341 square feet of living area. The dwellings are from 75 to 112 years old. The comparables each have a full basement, two of which have finished area. Each comparable has from two to four full bathrooms, central air conditioning and either a 1-car, a 2-car or a 3-car garage. Two comparables each have either one or two additional half bathrooms and three comparables each have from one to three fireplaces. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$97,152 to \$149,875 or from \$32.35 to \$37.04 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 ten comparable properties for the Board's consideration. The Board has given less weight to the appellant's comparables #2, #3, #5 and #6, as well as board of review comparable #4 due to differences from the subject dwelling in size and/or age.

The Board finds the appellant's comparables #1 and #4, along with board of review comparables #1, #2 and #3 have the same assessment neighborhood code and property classification code as the subject. These five comparables are overall most similar to the subject dwelling in size and age. However, the comparables have varying degrees of similarity when compared to the subject

in features such as bathroom count, fireplace count, basement finish and/or garage capacity, suggesting adjustments would be required to make the comparables more equivalent to the subject. Nevertheless, the comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$64,067 to \$102,651 or from \$21.44 to \$37.04 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$88,460 or \$30.79 per square foot of living area falls within the range established by the best comparables in the record both in terms of total improvement assessment and on a per square foot of living area basis. After considering adjustments to the best 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.

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 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 presented.

Based on this record, the Board finds 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: September 16, 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

Joel Schneider, by attorney:  
George N. Reveliotis  
Reveliotis Law, P.C.  
1030 Higgins Road  
Suite 101  
Park Ridge, IL 60068

COUNTY

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