



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

APPELLANT: Noel Lopez
DOCKET NO.: 18-31205.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 13-16-424-016-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Noel Lopez, the appellant, by attorney Spiro Zarkos, of Verros Berkshire, PC 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: \$6,720
IMPR.: \$25,141
TOTAL: \$31,861

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 2018 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, multi-family building of masonry exterior construction with 2,496 square feet of building area. The building is approximately 102 years old, has a full unfinished basement, and a 2-car detached garage. The property has a 4,635 square foot site and is located in Chicago, Jefferson Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-11 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 equity comparables that are located within the same neighborhood code as the subject property. The comparables are improved with two-story or three-story, class 2-11, multi-family buildings of masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 6,207 to 8,076 square feet of building area.

The buildings range in age from 92 to 106 years old and have full basements, two of which have apartments. One comparable has central air conditioning and a 3-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$51,161 to \$64,226 or from \$7.95 to \$8.94 per square foot of building area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested that the subject's improvement assessment be reduced to \$20,817 or \$8.34 per square foot of building area.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$31,861. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$25,141 or \$10.07 per square foot of building area. In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted information on four equity comparables that are located within the same neighborhood code as the subject property. The comparables are improved with two-story, class 2-11, multi-family buildings of masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 2,466 to 2,656 square feet of building area. The buildings range in age from 107 to 110 years old. Three comparables have full unfinished basements, and one comparable has a concrete slab foundation. Three comparables have either a 1.5-car or a 2-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$25,809 to \$31,542 or from \$10.19 to \$12.79 per square foot of building 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 evidence in the record does not support a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The parties submitted eight suggested comparables for the Board's consideration. The Board gives less weight to the appellant's comparables due to their considerably larger building sizes when compared to the subject building. The Board also gives less weight to the board of review comparable #3 which lacks a basement, unlike the subject.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be the board of review's remaining comparables. These comparables are similar in location, age, building size, and foundation when compared to the subject. These comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$26,417 to \$31,542 or from \$10.19 to \$12.79 per square foot of building area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$25,141 or \$10.07 per square foot of building area falls below the range established by the best comparables in this record. 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 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:

April 19, 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

Noel Lopez, by attorney:
Spiro Zarkos
Verros Berkshire, PC
225 West Randolph
Suite 2950
Chicago, IL 60606

COUNTY

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