



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

APPELLANT: Joseph Skiba
DOCKET NO.: 21-48723.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 20-04-116-007-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Joseph Skiba, the appellant, by Mary Kate Gorman, Attorney at Law in Tinley Park; 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: \$3,125
IMPR.: \$26,875
TOTAL: \$30,000

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 2-story multi-family building of masonry exterior construction with 2,625 square feet of building area. The building is 24 years old. Features include an unfinished basement and a 3-car garage. The property has a 3,125 square foot site and is located in Chicago, Lake 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 regard to the improvement as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted information on three comparables located within the subject's assessment neighborhood and from 0.58 to 0.86 of a mile from the subject. The comparables consist of class 2-11 multi-family buildings of masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 2,630 to 2,900 square feet of building area. The buildings are 118 to 138 years old and have basements. No data was provided concerning the finished basement area, if any. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$22,900 to

\$23,931 or from \$7.90 to \$9.10 per square foot of building area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to \$22,470 or \$8.56 per square foot of living area.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$30,000. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$26,875 or \$10.24 per square foot of building area.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four comparables located within the subject's assessment neighborhood and within .25 of a mile from the subject. The comparables consist of 2-story class 2-11 multi-family buildings of masonry exterior construction with 2,214 square feet of building area. The buildings are each 120 years old and have a basement, one of which has finished area. Three comparables each have a 2-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$23,690 to \$29,875 or from \$10.70 to \$13.49 per square foot of 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 seven comparables for the Board's consideration. The Board finds all of the comparables have considerably older aged buildings, ranging from 120 to 138 years old, relative to the subject's 24-year-old building. The Board gives less weight to the appellant's comparables and the board of review comparable #1 for lack of a garage amenity, which is a feature of the subject.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be the board of review comparables #2, #3 and #4. Although these comparables are more similar in location and have a garage amenity, like the subject, the comparables are inferior given their considerably older ages as well as smaller building and garages size in relation to the subject property. These three comparables have improvement assessments that range from \$23,690 to \$29,875 or from \$10.70 to \$13.49 per square foot of building area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$26,875 or \$10.24 per square foot of building area falls within the range established by the best comparables in the record on an overall basis and below the range on a per-square-foot basis. Based on the evidence and after considering adjustments to the best comparables for differences from the subject, 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: _____

February 18, 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

Joseph Skiba, by attorney:
Mary Kate Gorman
Attorney at Law
18400 Maple Creek Drive
Suite 200
Tinley Park, IL 60477

COUNTY

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