



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

APPELLANT: Candice Davis  
DOCKET NO.: 20-35863.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 30-32-315-004-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Candice Davis, the appellant, by attorney Dora Cornelio, of Schmidt Salzman & Moran, Ltd. 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:** \$2,131  
**IMPR.:** \$14,952  
**TOTAL:** \$17,083

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 2020 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 2-story multi-family building of frame exterior construction with 2,132 square feet of building area. The building is approximately 142 years old. Features of the building include an unfinished basement and a 3.5-car garage.<sup>1</sup> The property has a 4,488 square foot site and is located in Lansing, Thornton Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-11 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant, through counsel, marked contention of law and lack of assessment equity concerning the improvement as the bases of the appeal. However, the counsel's brief addresses only the inequity argument. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted information on

---

<sup>1</sup> Property characteristics of the subject not disclosed by the appellant were gleaned from the evidence presented by the board of review.

four equity comparables located in the same neighborhood code as the subject property, where comparable #4 was submitted twice and appears to be a multi-parcel property. The four comparables are improved with 2-story, class 2-11 multi-family buildings of frame, masonry, or frame and masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 1,815 to 3,123 square feet of building area. The homes range in age from 52 to 86 years old. Three comparables have a basement, two of which have finished area, and one comparable is reported to lack a basement foundation. Each comparable has central air conditioning and one comparable has a 2-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$3,762 to \$16,390 or from \$1.58 to \$5.25 per square foot of building area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested that the subject's improvement assessment be reduced.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$17,083. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$14,952 or \$7.01 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, one of which is located in the same neighborhood code as the subject property. The comparables are improved with 1-story or 2-story, class 2-11 multi-family buildings of frame, masonry, or frame and masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 1,941 to 2,563 square feet of building area. The comparables range in age from 58 to 142 years old. Each comparable has a basement, where one is finished with an apartment, one comparable has central air conditioning, and three comparables each have from a 1.5-car to 2.5-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$9,783 to \$13,089 or from \$4.58 to \$6.66 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 appellant 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 nine suggested comparables for the Board's consideration with only the appellant's comparable #4 being the only comparable truly similar to the subject in age and dwelling size. The remaining comparables in this record present significant differences from the subject in age, dwelling size, foundation type, and/or other features. Nevertheless, the comparables in this record have improvement assessments ranging from \$18,557 to \$34,436 or from \$8.28 to \$17.03 per square foot of building area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$14,952 or \$7.01 per square foot of living area falls within the range established by the comparables in this record. Based on this record, 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

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: \_\_\_\_\_

July 16, 2024



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

Candice Davis, by attorney:  
Dora Cornelio  
Schmidt Salzman & Moran, Ltd.  
111 W. Washington St.  
Suite 1300  
Chicago, IL 60602

COUNTY

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