



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

APPELLANT: Sheri Maxfield  
DOCKET NO.: 21-32661.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 14-21-310-042-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Sheri Maxfield, the appellant, by attorney Daniel G. Pikarski, of Gordon & Pikarski, 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:** \$64,290  
**IMPR.:** \$195,500  
**TOTAL:** \$259,790

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 2021 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 and part three-story Victorian dwelling of masonry exterior construction with 4,481 square feet of living area.<sup>1</sup> The dwelling is approximately 133 years old. Features include a basement with finished area, central air conditioning and one fireplace and two parking spaces via a detached garage.<sup>2</sup> The property has a 6,429 square foot site and is located in Chicago, Lake View Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-06 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

---

<sup>1</sup> The appellant's appraiser included the finished basement level in the total gross building area of the home reporting and utilizing 5,255 square feet of above and below grade area for purposes of analysis.

<sup>2</sup> The assessing officials report the subject dwelling has no garage amenity contrary to the appellant's appraisal report indicating a two-car garage with a second story coach house that lacks access from the house.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted an appraisal prepared by Ibi Cole, MAI, AI-GRS, a Certified General Appraiser, and Donn Calloway, a Certified Trainee Appraiser, estimating the subject property had a market value of \$1,730,000 as of January 1, 2021. The intended use of the appraisal was to estimate current market value for *ad valorem* assessment purposes. The appraisers utilized the sales comparison approach in the appraisal report.

Upon inspection of the dwelling, the appraisers reported deferred maintenance and functional obsolescence. The appraisers described evidence of settlement, first floor cracking in walls and ceilings and moisture intrusion in a third-story bedroom suggesting inadequate drainage and/or roofing issues. The subject also was described as having an easement that shares driveway access to rear parking garages “with the property to the immediate west.” (Appraisal, pp. 14-15, 79-82).

For the sales comparison approach, the appraisers analyzed five comparable sales located in Chicago and within .30 of a mile from the subject. The comparable parcels range in size from 3,058 to 5,493 square feet of land area and are improved with Traditional, Colonial, Greystone, Tri-Level or Prairie dwellings built from 1889 to 1921, where sale #1 was rehabbed/rebuilt in 2012, sale #2 was rehabbed in 2018, and sale #3 was rehabbed in 2015. The comparables have “reconciled building areas” ranging from 3,094 to 4,880 square feet. Features of the homes include full finished basements, central air conditioning, one to three fireplaces, and four comparables have either a two-car or a three-car garage. Comparable #1 has heated floors. The comparables sold from August 2018 to June 2021 for prices ranging from \$1,581,111 to \$1,900,000.

As part of the analysis, the appraisers adjusted for differences in bedroom count, bathroom count, both full bath and half-bath, garage capacity, and some special features/amenities such as heated floors resulting in adjusted sales prices ranging from \$1,686,111 to \$2,025,000 or from \$360.66 to \$608.11 per square foot of reconciled building area, including land. Then as to adjustments for physical characteristics, four comparables were adjusted downward by 10% due to size, comparables #4 and #5 were each adjusted downward by 10% for superior condition, resulting in adjusted prices ranging from \$1,396,000 to \$1,822,500 or from \$324.59 to \$547.30 per square foot of reconciled living area, including land. From the foregoing adjusted sales data, the appraisers opined a market value for the subject of \$1,730,000, including land, under the sales comparison approach to value.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$259,790. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$2,597,900 or \$579.76 per square foot of living area, including land, when applying the level of assessment for class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance of 10%.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales, three of which are located in the same neighborhood code as the subject property. Board of review comparables #1 and #4 are the same properties as appraisal sales #2 and #5, respectively. The two new comparables presented by the board of review consist of parcels of 6,450 and 3,024 square feet of land area. The parcels are improved with

class 2-06 two-story dwellings of masonry exterior construction. The dwellings are 98 and 128 years old and contain 4,982 and 2,614 square feet of living area, respectively. These comparables have a slab and full basement with finished area, respectively. Each dwelling has central air conditioning and a two-car garage. One comparable has three fireplaces. These comparables sold in June 2020 and February 2021 for prices of \$2,800,000 and \$1,699,000 or for \$562.02 and \$649.96 per square foot of living area, including land, respectively.

Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

### **Conclusion of Law**

The appellant contends the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in its assessed valuation. When market value is the basis of the appeal the value of the property must be proved by a preponderance of the evidence. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). Proof of market value may consist of an appraisal of the subject property, a recent sale, comparable sales or construction costs. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(c). The Board finds the appellant did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The appellant submitted an appraisal of the subject property which utilized the sales comparison approach in arriving at an opinion of market value and the board of review presented four suggested comparable sales, two of which were utilized in the appraisal report, in support of the parties' respective positions before the Property Tax Appeal Board.

The Board has given reduced weight to the appellant's appraisal report which set forth an analysis of the subject dwelling using the finished basement as well as the above-grade living area in order to perform a comparable sales analysis with a gross building area for the subject of 5,255 square feet. However, as shown in the evidence the subject dwelling contains a significantly smaller amount of above-grade living area, as the finished basement area reportedly contains 1,736 square feet as set forth on page 74 of the appraisal. Furthermore, the details on the comparable sales properties lack any detail as to the size of finished basement area for purposes of analysis of the comparability of the properties to the subject and/or other sales in the record. Given the foregoing flaws and contradictions, the Board has given no weight to the value conclusion in the appraisal report.

While ordinarily, the Board would then analyze the raw sales data presented by both parties, in this instance, the Board finds that the lack of information concerning finished basement area of the appraisal's comparable properties prevents the Board from engaging in a meaningful analysis of the appraisal sales data.

The Board has given reduced weight to appraisal sale #2/ board of review sale #1 due to its date of sale in September 2018, a date more remote in time to the lien date at issue herein and to other sales in the record. The Board has given reduced weight to appraisal sale #1, which was rehabbed and remodeled in 2012, indicating a newer effective age of this property when compared to the subject. The Board has given reduced weight to appraisal sale #3 which is described as a Tri-Level home as compared to the subject Victorian style and this home was rehabbed in 2015, again indicating a likely newer effective age than the subject.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be appraisal sale #4 and the board of review comparable sales #2, #3 and #4, including one common sale, which present varying degrees of similarity to the subject property. Adjustments to these comparables are necessary for differences in age, dwelling size, basement finish and/or garage capacity when compared to the subject in order to make the comparables more equivalent to the subject property. The comparables sold from March 2020 to July 2021 for prices ranging from \$1,645,000 to \$2,800,000 or from \$348.36 to \$649.96 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$2,597,900 or \$579.76 per square foot of living area, including land, which is within the range established by the best comparable sales in the record both in terms of overall value and on a price per square foot basis which appears logical once adjustments are made for differences to the comparable properties when compared to the subject.

Based on this evidence and after considering adjustments to the best comparable sales in the 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: \_\_\_\_\_

January 21, 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

Sheri Maxfield, by attorney:  
Daniel G. Pikarski  
Gordon & Pikarski  
55 West Monroe Street  
Suite 940  
Chicago, IL 60603

COUNTY

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