



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

APPELLANT: University Commons IV Condominium Association
DOCKET NO.: 17-35146.001-R-3 through 17-35146.158-R-3
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are University Commons IV Condominium Association, the appellant(s), by attorney David C. Dunkin, of Saul Ewing Arnstein & Lehr LLP in Chicago; the Cook County Board of Review; the Chicago Board of Education intervenor, by attorney Ares G. Dalianis of Franczek P.C. in Chicago.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented in this matter, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds **A Reduction** 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:

DOCKET NO	PARCEL NUMBER	LAND	IMPRVMT	TOTAL
17-35146.001-R-3	17-20-227-060-1002	1,845	19,434	\$ 21,279
17-35146.002-R-3	17-20-227-060-1004	1,633	19,434	\$ 21,067
17-35146.003-R-3	17-20-227-060-1005	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.004-R-3	17-20-227-060-1007	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.005-R-3	17-20-227-060-1008	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.006-R-3	17-20-227-060-1009	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.007-R-3	17-20-227-060-1012	1,633	19,434	\$ 21,067
17-35146.008-R-3	17-20-227-060-1013	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.009-R-3	17-20-227-060-1014	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.010-R-3	17-20-227-060-1016	1,551	18,461	\$ 20,012
17-35146.011-R-3	17-20-227-060-1017	1,088	12,955	\$ 14,043
17-35146.012-R-3	17-20-227-060-1018	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.013-R-3	17-20-227-060-1019	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.014-R-3	17-20-227-060-1021	1,475	17,556	\$ 19,031
17-35146.015-R-3	17-20-227-060-1023	1,524	18,137	\$ 19,661
17-35146.016-R-3	17-20-227-060-1024	1,524	18,137	\$ 19,661
17-35146.017-R-3	17-20-227-060-1025	1,524	18,137	\$ 19,661
17-35146.018-R-3	17-20-227-060-1029	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.019-R-3	17-20-227-060-1030	1,633	19,434	\$ 21,067
17-35146.020-R-3	17-20-227-060-1034	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.021-R-3	17-20-227-060-1035	1,415	16,841	\$ 18,256
17-35146.022-R-3	17-20-227-060-1036	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.023-R-3	17-20-227-060-1039	1,469	17,489	\$ 18,958
17-35146.024-R-3	17-20-227-060-1040	1,469	17,489	\$ 18,958

17-35146.025-R-3	17-20-227-060-1042	1,143	13,603	\$ 14,746
17-35146.026-R-3	17-20-227-060-1044	1,143	13,603	\$ 14,746
17-35146.027-R-3	17-20-227-060-1045	1,143	13,603	\$ 14,746
17-35146.028-R-3	17-20-227-060-1046	1,143	13,603	\$ 14,746
17-35146.029-R-3	17-20-227-060-1048	1,143	13,603	\$ 14,746
17-35146.030-R-3	17-20-227-060-1049	1,143	13,603	\$ 14,746
17-35146.031-R-3	17-20-227-060-1050	1,143	13,603	\$ 14,746
17-35146.032-R-3	17-20-227-060-1051	1,143	13,603	\$ 14,746
17-35146.033-R-3	17-20-227-060-1052	1,143	13,603	\$ 14,746
17-35146.034-R-3	17-20-227-060-1053	1,143	13,603	\$ 14,746
17-35146.035-R-3	17-20-227-060-1054	1,143	13,603	\$ 14,746
17-35146.036-R-3	17-20-227-060-1056	1,469	17,489	\$ 18,958
17-35146.037-R-3	17-20-227-060-1057	1,905	22,674	\$ 24,579
17-35146.038-R-3	17-20-227-060-1058	1,034	12,307	\$ 13,341
17-35146.039-R-3	17-20-227-060-1059	2,198	26,151	\$ 28,349
17-35146.040-R-3	17-20-227-060-1060	1,905	22,674	\$ 24,579
17-35146.041-R-3	17-20-227-060-1063	1,469	17,489	\$ 18,958
17-35146.042-R-3	17-20-227-060-1064	1,469	17,489	\$ 18,958
17-35146.043-R-3	17-20-227-060-1067	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.044-R-3	17-20-227-060-1068	2,014	23,971	\$ 25,985
17-35146.045-R-3	17-20-227-060-1071	1,469	17,489	\$ 18,958
17-35146.046-R-3	17-20-227-060-1072	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.047-R-3	17-20-227-060-1073	1,333	15,869	\$ 17,202
17-35146.048-R-3	17-20-227-060-1074	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.049-R-3	17-20-227-060-1075	1,872	22,284	\$ 24,156
17-35146.050-R-3	17-20-227-060-1076	1,742	20,730	\$ 22,472
17-35146.051-R-3	17-20-227-060-1077	1,361	16,193	\$ 17,554
17-35146.052-R-3	17-20-227-060-1078	1,279	15,221	\$ 16,500
17-35146.053-R-3	17-20-227-060-1082	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.054-R-3	17-20-227-060-1083	1,197	14,248	\$ 15,445
17-35146.055-R-3	17-20-227-060-1087	1,197	14,248	\$ 15,445
17-35146.056-R-3	17-20-227-060-1088	1,197	14,248	\$ 15,445
17-35146.057-R-3	17-20-227-060-1091	1,197	14,248	\$ 15,445
17-35146.058-R-3	17-20-227-060-1092	1,197	14,248	\$ 15,445
17-35146.059-R-3	17-20-227-060-1093	1,197	14,248	\$ 15,445
17-35146.060-R-3	17-20-227-060-1094	1,197	14,248	\$ 15,445
17-35146.061-R-3	17-20-227-060-1097	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.062-R-3	17-20-227-060-1098	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.063-R-3	17-20-227-060-1099	1,938	23,062	\$ 25,000
17-35146.064-R-3	17-20-227-060-1104	1,469	17,478	\$ 18,947
17-35146.065-R-3	17-20-227-060-1106	1,469	17,489	\$ 18,958
17-35146.066-R-3	17-20-227-060-1107	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.067-R-3	17-20-227-060-1108	1,333	15,869	\$ 17,202
17-35146.068-R-3	17-20-227-060-1109	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.069-R-3	17-20-227-060-1111	1,469	17,489	\$ 18,958

17-35146.070-R-3	17-20-227-060-1116	1,578	18,785	\$ 20,363
17-35146.071-R-3	17-20-227-060-1117	1,872	22,284	\$ 24,156
17-35146.072-R-3	17-20-227-060-1118	1,851	21,749	\$ 23,600
17-35146.073-R-3	17-20-227-060-1119	1,361	16,193	\$ 17,554
17-35146.074-R-3	17-20-227-060-1120	1,279	15,221	\$ 16,500
17-35146.075-R-3	17-20-227-060-1123	1,687	20,082	\$ 21,769
17-35146.076-R-3	17-20-227-060-1126	1,687	20,082	\$ 21,769
17-35146.077-R-3	17-20-227-060-1127	1,687	20,082	\$ 21,769
17-35146.078-R-3	17-20-227-060-1128	1,687	20,082	\$ 21,769
17-35146.079-R-3	17-20-227-060-1129	1,687	20,082	\$ 21,769
17-35146.080-R-3	17-20-227-060-1131	1,796	21,378	\$ 23,174
17-35146.081-R-3	17-20-227-060-1134	1,306	15,545	\$ 16,851
17-35146.082-R-3	17-20-227-060-1139	1,742	20,730	\$ 22,472
17-35146.083-R-3	17-20-227-060-1142	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.084-R-3	17-20-227-060-1143	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.085-R-3	17-20-227-060-1145	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.086-R-3	17-20-227-060-1147	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.087-R-3	17-20-227-060-1148	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.088-R-3	17-20-227-060-1152	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.089-R-3	17-20-227-060-1154	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.090-R-3	17-20-227-060-1156	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.091-R-3	17-20-227-060-1157	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.092-R-3	17-20-227-060-1158	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.093-R-3	17-20-227-060-1160	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.094-R-3	17-20-227-060-1163	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.095-R-3	17-20-227-060-1164	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.096-R-3	17-20-227-060-1165	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.097-R-3	17-20-227-060-1166	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.098-R-3	17-20-227-060-1167	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.099-R-3	17-20-227-060-1169	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.100-R-3	17-20-227-060-1170	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.101-R-3	17-20-227-060-1171	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.102-R-3	17-20-227-060-1173	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.103-R-3	17-20-227-060-1175	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.104-R-3	17-20-227-060-1178	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.105-R-3	17-20-227-060-1180	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.106-R-3	17-20-227-060-1182	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.107-R-3	17-20-227-060-1184	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.108-R-3	17-20-227-060-1185	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.109-R-3	17-20-227-060-1187	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.110-R-3	17-20-227-060-1188	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.111-R-3	17-20-227-060-1189	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.112-R-3	17-20-227-060-1193	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.113-R-3	17-20-227-060-1194	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.114-R-3	17-20-227-060-1196	163	1,944	\$ 2,107

17-35146.115-R-3	17-20-227-060-1199	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.116-R-3	17-20-227-060-1200	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.117-R-3	17-20-227-060-1201	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.118-R-3	17-20-227-060-1203	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.119-R-3	17-20-227-060-1205	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.120-R-3	17-20-227-060-1207	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.121-R-3	17-20-227-060-1208	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.122-R-3	17-20-227-060-1213	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.123-R-3	17-20-227-060-1214	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.124-R-3	17-20-227-060-1215	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.125-R-3	17-20-227-060-1217	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.126-R-3	17-20-227-060-1218	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.127-R-3	17-20-227-060-1221	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.128-R-3	17-20-227-060-1222	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.129-R-3	17-20-227-060-1223	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.130-R-3	17-20-227-060-1225	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.131-R-3	17-20-227-060-1228	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.132-R-3	17-20-227-060-1229	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.133-R-3	17-20-227-060-1230	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.134-R-3	17-20-227-060-1232	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.135-R-3	17-20-227-060-1233	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.136-R-3	17-20-227-060-1236	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.137-R-3	17-20-227-060-1237	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.138-R-3	17-20-227-060-1241	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.139-R-3	17-20-227-060-1245	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.140-R-3	17-20-227-060-1246	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.141-R-3	17-20-227-060-1247	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.142-R-3	17-20-227-060-1248	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.143-R-3	17-20-227-060-1249	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.144-R-3	17-20-227-060-1252	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.145-R-3	17-20-227-060-1255	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.146-R-3	17-20-227-060-1256	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.147-R-3	17-20-227-060-1257	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.148-R-3	17-20-227-060-1258	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.149-R-3	17-20-227-060-1259	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.150-R-3	17-20-227-060-1262	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.151-R-3	17-20-227-060-1264	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.152-R-3	17-20-227-060-1266	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.153-R-3	17-20-227-060-1271	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.154-R-3	17-20-227-060-1272	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.155-R-3	17-20-227-060-1274	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.156-R-3	17-20-227-060-1277	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.157-R-3	17-20-227-060-1278	163	1,944	\$ 2,107
17-35146.158-R-3	17-20-227-060-1279	163	1,944	\$ 2,107

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant timely filed the appeal pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) after receiving a decision from the Cook County Board of Review. The instant appeal challenges the assessment for tax year 2017. The Property Tax Appeal Board (the “Board”) finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal.

Findings of Fact

The subject consists of 82 residential condominium units (the “Subject Residential Units”) and 76 parking spaces (the “Subject Parking Spaces”) with a combined 57.65750% total ownership interest in the common elements (collectively, the “Subject Units”). The condominium building has an additional 58 residential units (the “Other Residential Units”) and 64 parking spaces (the “Other Parking Spaces”) that are not part of the instant appeal (collectively, the “Other Units”), for a total of 140 residential units and 140 parking spaces. The property is located in West Chicago Township, Cook County. The subject units are all classified as class 2-99 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant contends assessment inequity as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant argued that the Subject Residential Units all receive an exemption under the Historic Residence Assessment Freeze Law (“HRAFL”). 35 ILCS 200/10-40 *et al.* The appellant further asserted that, when determining the improvement assessment for the Subject Units, the base market value for the units, excluding land, used by the board of review was \$33,888,888. Contrarily, the appellant argues, the Other Residential Units do not receive an exemption under the HRAFL, and that, when determining the improvement assessment for the Other Units, the base market value for the units, excluding land, used by the board of review was \$27,698,890. In support of these assertions, the appellant submitted Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”) printouts from the Cook County Assessor for all 280 units within the condominium building. In accordance with Article IX, Section 4 of the Constitution of the State of Illinois, the appellant requests that the Subject Units’ assessments be calculated using the same base market value for the building of \$27,698,890 that was used to calculate the assessment for the Other Units. Based on this evidence, the appellant requests that the Subject Units’ assessment be reduced to \$1,733,200.

The Board’s own review of the FOIA printouts submitted by the appellant revealed that the appellant’s factual description is generally, but not entirely, accurate. The Subject Residential Units’ base market value, excluding land, was either \$33,888,255 (1 unit), \$33,888,880 (31 units), or \$33,888,888, as the appellant asserted (50 units). The Other Residential Units’ base market value, excluding land, was either \$21,375,639 (3 units), \$25,119,020 (1 unit), \$26,995,041 (1 unit), \$27,447,372 (1 unit), \$27,698,147 (1 unit), \$27,698,890, as the appellant asserted (50 units), or \$38,888,888 (1 unit). Additionally, 69 of the 82 Subject Residential Units receive an exemption under the HRAFL, while the remaining 13 Subject Residential Units do not receive the exemption. None of the Other Residential Units receive an exemption under the HRAFL.

The board of review submitted its “Board of Review Notes on Appeal” disclosing that the total assessment for the Subject Units is \$2,074,794.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted a condominium analysis showing that 35 residential units in the subject’s building and 39 parking spaces, or 27.5235% of ownership in the common elements, sold between February 2015 and March 2019 for an aggregate price of \$9,996,307. This analysis included five of the subject units. The aggregate sale price was then divided by the percentage of ownership interest in the common elements of the units sold to arrive at a total market value for the building of \$36,319,171.

The intervenor adopted the evidence submitted by the board of review. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.99.

At hearing, the appellant reaffirmed the evidence previously submitted. The board of review rested on the evidence previously submitted. The intervenor argued that the appellant’s comparison between the units with the HRAFL exemption and the units without the HRAFL exemption was an inaccurate comparison, as the former units were assessed under a different method of valuation under the HRAFL statute.

At the conclusion of the hearing, the Board requested that the appellant submit the base year and the base year valuation for the Subject Units, as those terms are defined in the HRAFL. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.67(k)(3); 35 ILCS 200/10-40(i). The appellant timely submitted a printout from the Cook County Assessor’s website showing the assessment for all 140 of the residential units and all 140 parking spaces within the subject building for tax year 2008. The appellant asserted that 2008 was the base year. Although given an opportunity by the Board to respond this submission, the board of review and intervenor did not do so.

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 proven 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 meet this burden of proof, and that a reduction in the subject’s assessment is warranted.

“Except as otherwise provided in this Section, taxes upon real property shall be levied uniformly by valuation ascertained as the General Assembly shall provide by law.” Ill. Const. art IX, § 4(a). “The principle of uniformity of taxation requires that similar properties within the same district be assessed on a similar basis.” Kankakee Cty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 131 Ill.2d 1, 21 (1989) (citing Apex Motor Fuel Co. v. Barrett, 20 Ill.2d 395, 401 (1960)). “The cornerstone of uniform assessment is the fair cash value of the property in question.” Kankakee, 131 Ill.2d at 21. “Real property taxes . . . which are authorized by law to be assessed against and levied upon real property shall be assessed against and levied upon each unit and the

owner's corresponding percentage of ownership in the common elements as a tract, and not upon the property as a whole." 765 ILCS 605/10(a).

With these well-established principles in mind, it is clear from the FOIA printouts submitted by the appellant that the board of review assessed the Subject Residential Units based on a market value that is significantly higher than the market it used to assess the Other Residential Units. The FOIA printouts show that all 82 of the Subject Residential Units were assessed based on a market value of \$33,888,255, \$33,888,880, or \$33,888,888, excluding land. On the other hand, the Other Residential Units were assessed based on market values that ranged from \$21,375,639 to \$38,888,888, excluding land, but with a vast majority being assessed based on a market value of \$27,698,890, excluding land.

Looking to the Illinois Supreme Court's opinion in Kankakee, it is clear that the use of such disparate market values for condominium units located within the same building runs afoul of the uniformity clause in the Illinois Constitution. Moreover, the use of different market values for different condominium units also violates section 10(a) of the Condominium Property Act, which requires that a unit owner only be assessed based on their "corresponding percentage of ownership in the common elements as a tract."

The Board finds that the intervenor's argument, made at hearing, is without merit. The intervenor argued that the comparison between the units with the HRAFL exemption and the units without the HRAFL exemption would be an inaccurate comparison, as the former units are assessed using a different method of valuation under the HRAFL statute. Under the HRAFL, it is true that the market value for property that receives the exemption is calculated differently. Even under the HRAFL itself, there are different methods of valuation based on how many years have passed since the property was occupied subsequent to the rehabilitation. For example, property that receives the exemption and has been occupied for ten years, such as the subject, has a market value equal to the base year valuation plus 50% of the adjustment in value. 35 ILCS 200/10-40(j) and 10-50.

However, the appellant's argument was not based on the application of the valuation methodology provided for in the HRAFL. Instead, the appellant's argument uses the designation of the HRAFL exemption as a means of distinguishing those units as having been assessed based on a higher market value. The fact that those units may ultimately be valued and assessed in a different manner than units without the HRAFL exemption has no bearing on this appeal. Whether a unit receives an HRAFL exemption or not, the current market value of the unit must still be ascertained. See 35 ILCS 200/10-40(j) ("Adjustment in value" means the difference for any year between the *then current fair cash value* and the base year valuation.") (emphasis added); 35 ILCS 200/10-50 ("For the 4 years after the expiration of the 8-year valuation period, the valuation for purposes of computing the assessed valuation shall be as follows: For the second year, the base year valuation plus 50% of the *adjustment in value*.") (emphasis added); 35 ILCS 200/9-155 ("Valuation in general assessment years. . . .[T]he assessor, in person or by deputy, shall actually view and determine as near as practicable the value of each property listed for taxation as of January 1 of that year . . ."). Under the Illinois Constitution, that market value must be uniform. It is not in this appeal. Therefore, based on this record, the Board finds the appellant has proven, with clear and convincing evidence, that the Subject Units are inequitably

assessed, and that a reduction in their respective assessments is warranted to the assessments requested by the appellant.

The Board makes no findings of fact or conclusions of law regarding 1) the market value of the Subject Units, or 2) the application of the special valuation methodology found in the HRAFL to the Subject Units. Neither of these issues were raised by the appellant. In this Final Administrative Decision, the Board only finds that the Subject Units are inequitably assessed, and sets their respective assessments to the assessment requested by the appellant.

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 20, 2022



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

University Commons IV Condominium Association, by attorney:
David C. Dunkin
Saul Ewing Arnstein & Lehr LLP
161 North Clark
Suite 4200
Chicago, IL 60601

COUNTY

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

INTERVENOR

Chicago Board of Education, by attorney:
Ares G. Dalianis
Franczek P.C.
300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60606