



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

APPELLANT: James Andros
DOCKET NO.: 23-52091.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 04-36-312-033-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are James Andros, 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: \$18,000
IMPR.: \$51,334
TOTAL: \$69,334

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 1-story dwelling of masonry exterior construction with 2,426 square feet of living area. The dwelling is approximately 67 years old. Features of the home include a crawl space foundation, 1 full and 1 half bathrooms, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a 2-car garage. The property has an 11,250 square foot site and is located in Glenview, Northfield Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-04 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 four comparables located within the subject's assessment neighborhood and within 0.5 of a mile from the subject property. The comparables consist of class 2-04, 1-story dwellings of masonry or frame and masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 2,121 to 2,731 square feet of living area. The

comparables are 60 to 87 years old. Three comparables have a full or partial basement and 1 additional half bathroom. One comparable has a slab foundation. Each comparable has 1 or 2 full bathrooms, central air conditioning and a fireplace. Two comparables have either a 1-car or a 2-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments that range from \$42,972 to \$52,685 or from \$18.85 to \$20.26 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested that the subject's improvement assessment be reduced to \$46,870 or \$19.32 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 \$69,334. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$51,334 or \$21.16 per square foot of living area. In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted information on four comparables located within the subject's assessment neighborhood and within the same block or subarea as the subject or approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile from the subject property. The comparables consist of class 2-04, 1-story or "1.7 story" dwellings of frame or masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 2,438 to 3,577 square feet of living area. The homes are 64 to 70 years old. Each comparable has a partial basement with one having finished area, 2 or 3 full bathrooms, 1 or 2 fireplaces and either a 1-car or a 2-car garage. One comparable has 1 half bathroom, and three comparables each have central air conditioning. The comparables have improvement assessments that range from \$52,710 to \$86,024 or from \$22.08 to \$24.05 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested the subject's assessment be confirmed.

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 eight equity comparables for the Board's consideration, of which the appellant's comparable #4 is the only comparable in the record that lacks a basement foundation, like the subject. Nevertheless, the Board gives less weight to the appellant's comparable #1 and #2 as well as the board of review comparables #3 and #4 which are less similar to the subject in story height, dwelling size and/or age than the other comparables in the record.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be the appellant's comparables #3 and #4 as well as the board of review's comparables #1 and #2. These comparables are overall most similar from the subject in location, story height, age and dwelling size but still require adjustments for differences to the subject given their larger bathroom count, basement foundation, and/or lack of a garage amenity, a feature of the subject. These four comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$42,972 to \$54,000 or from \$18.86 to \$22.08 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$51,334 or \$21.16 per square foot of living area falls within the range established by the best comparables in the record.

Additionally, the subject has a higher overall improvement assessment relative to the appellant's comparable #4 which is the only comparable in the record that lacks a basement foundation, like the subject, but is logical given it lacks a garage amenity, unlike the subject. After considering adjustments to the best comparables for differences when compared 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 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 appears to exist 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: _____

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: _____

November 25, 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

James Andros, 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