



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

APPELLANT: Sophie Tabor  
DOCKET NO.: 21-41610.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 13-17-119-037-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Sophie Tabor, 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:** \$13,910  
**IMPR.:** \$50,089  
**TOTAL:** \$63,999

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 three-story multi-family building of masonry exterior construction with 6,075 square feet of gross building area and is approximately 46 years old. Features include a concrete slab foundation and six full bathrooms.<sup>1</sup> The property has a 4,968 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 concerning the improvement as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted information on four equity

---

<sup>1</sup> In Section III, the appellant reports the building lacks air conditioning, despite reporting this feature in Section V. Given the data in Section III and the board of review unrefuted assertion that the building lacks air conditioning, the Board finds the subject lacks this amenity.

comparables located in the same neighborhood code as the subject. The comparables consist of class 2-11 buildings of masonry exterior construction that range in age from 57 to 97 years old. The buildings range in size from 5,379 to 7,148 square feet of gross building area. Features include full or partial basements, 5 or 6 full bathrooms and comparable #2 has an addition 2 half-baths. Other features include central air conditioning and comparables #1 and #2 each have a two-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$36,450 to \$47,780 or from \$6.41 to \$7.95 per square foot of gross building area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduced improvement assessment of \$43,132 or \$7.10 per square foot of gross building area.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$63,999. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$50,089 or \$8.25 per square foot of gross building area.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted information on four equity comparables located in the same neighborhood code and either within the same tax block, the subarea, or within ¼ of a mile from the subject. The comparables consist of class 2-11 two-story or three-story multi-family buildings of masonry exterior construction that are from 46 to 94 years old. The buildings range in size from 5,527 to 6,075 square feet of gross building area. Three comparables have full basements finished as apartments and comparable #1 has a concrete slab foundation. The buildings each have 6 full bathrooms, comparable #4 has central air conditioning. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$48,247 to \$52,776 or from \$8.25 to \$9.55 per square foot of gross building area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

### **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 a total of eight equity comparables to support their respective positions before the Property Tax Appeal Board. The Board has given reduced weight to the appellant's comparables #2 and #4 as well as board of review comparable #4, due to differences in building sizes or age when compared to the subject building of 6,075 square feet which is 46 years old.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity on this record are appellant's comparables #1 and #3 along with board of review comparables #1, #2 and #3, which are more similar to the subject in location, age, building size, and some features. Downward adjustments are necessary to four of the best comparables for their basement feature and/or finished area which differ from the subject's slab foundation. Additional adjustments to the comparables are necessary for differences in bathroom count and/or garage amenity when compared to the

subject. These five best comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$36,450 to \$52,776 or from \$6.41 to \$9.55 per square foot of gross building area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$50,089 or \$8.25 per square foot of gross building area falls within the range established by the best comparables in this record both in terms of overall improvement assessment and on a per-square-foot of gross building area basis and is identical to board of review comparable #1 which is identical in most respects to the subject.

The constitutional provision for uniformity of taxation and valuation does not require mathematical equality. The requirement is satisfied if the intent is evident to adjust the taxation burden with a reasonable degree of uniformity and if such is the effect of the statute enacted by the General Assembly establishing the method of assessing real property in its general operation. 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 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.

Based on this record and after considering appropriate adjustments to the best comparables in the record 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: \_\_\_\_\_

December 17, 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

Sophie Tabor, 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