



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

APPELLANT: Christopher Coetzee  
DOCKET NO.: 21-50370.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 14-33-300-073-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Christopher Coetzee, the appellant, by attorney Abby L. Strauss, of Schiller Law P.C., 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:** \$39,300  
**IMPR.:** \$176,183  
**TOTAL:** \$215,483

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 dwelling of masonry exterior construction with 3,812 square feet of living area. The dwelling is approximately 25 years old. Features of the home include a full basement with a formal recreation room, 3½ bathrooms, central air conditioning, a fireplace, a two-car garage, and additional improvements that are not further identified on the record.<sup>1</sup> The property has a 3,144 square foot site and is located in Chicago, North Chicago Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-08 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 seven equity

---

<sup>1</sup> Additional details of the subject's characteristics were drawn from the board of review evidence which were not refuted by the appellant.

comparables set forth in a grid analysis. The comparables are each located in the same neighborhood code as the subject. The comparables consist of class 2-08 dwellings of masonry or frame and masonry exterior construction. The dwellings range in age from 19 to 43 years old and range in size from 3,816 to 4,871 square feet of living area. The comparables have full or partial basements, where no data on finished basement features, if any, was provided. The homes reportedly have 2 to 4 bathrooms, central air conditioning, and a two-car garage. Five comparables have from one to three fireplaces. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$136,225 to \$185,763 or from \$33.83 to \$40.85 per square foot of living area.

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduced improvement assessment of \$141,997 or \$37.25 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 \$215,483. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$176,183 or \$46.22 per square foot of living area.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted two grid analyses with information on eight equity comparables<sup>2</sup> located in the same neighborhood code and either on the same block or within ¼ of a mile from the subject. The comparables consist of class 2-08 two-story or three-story dwellings of masonry exterior construction that are 10 to 28 years old. The homes range in size from 3,801 to 4,040 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a full or partial basement, with a formal recreation room, and 3½ to 5½ bathrooms. Features include central air conditioning and a 2-car or a 2.5-car garage. Seven comparables have from one to three fireplaces. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$179,300 to \$240,225 or from \$46.27 to \$59.46 per square foot of living 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 fifteen equity comparables to support their respective positions before the Property Tax Appeal Board. The Board has given reduced weight to appellant's comparables #1 and #5, due to their differing dwelling sizes when compared to the subject. The Board has given reduced weight to appellant's comparable #2 as well as board of review comparables #5, due to their significantly differing ages when compared to the subject. Less

---

<sup>2</sup> For ease of reference, the Board has renumbered the second grid comparables as #5 through #8.

weight has been given by the Board to board of review comparable #1 which differs in story height in comparison to the subject.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity in the record are appellant's comparables #3, #4, #6 and #7 along with board of review comparables #2, #3 and #4 along with #6, #7 and #8, which are each more similar to the subject in age, story height, exterior construction, size, foundation type, and some features. These comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$140,000 to \$240,225 or from \$35.43 to \$59.46 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$176,183 or \$46.22 per square foot of living 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 living area basis, despite the lack of information as to finished basement area of the appellant's comparables which is a feature of the subject. Although the Board recognizes that the subject would be expected to be at the higher end of this range if all the comparables feature unfinished basements.

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 for differences when compared to the subject property, 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 15, 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

Christopher Coetzee, by attorney:  
Abby L. Strauss  
Schiller Law P.C.  
33 North Dearborn  
Suite 1130  
Chicago, IL 60602

COUNTY

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