FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION
ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Santa Fe Garden V Parking Condo Assoc.
DOCKET NO.: 21-55222.001-R-1 through 21-55222.104-R-1
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Santa Fe Garden V Parking Condo Assoc., the appellants, by attorney Angel Carpio, of Worsek & Vihon LLP 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:

DOCKET NO	PARCEL NUMBER	LAND	IMPRVMT	TOTAL
21-55222.001-R-1	17-21-436-052-1001	3,251	248	$3,499
21-55222.002-R-1	17-21-436-052-1002	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.003-R-1	17-21-436-052-1003	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.004-R-1	17-21-436-052-1004	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.005-R-1	17-21-436-052-1005	3,096	236	$3,332
21-55222.006-R-1	17-21-436-052-1006	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.007-R-1	17-21-436-052-1007	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.008-R-1	17-21-436-052-1008	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.009-R-1	17-21-436-052-1009	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.010-R-1	17-21-436-052-1010	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.011-R-1	17-21-436-052-1011	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.012-R-1	17-21-436-052-1012	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.013-R-1	17-21-436-052-1013	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.014-R-1	17-21-436-052-1015	3,273	250	$3,523
21-55222.015-R-1	17-21-436-052-1016	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.016-R-1	17-21-436-052-1017	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.017-R-1	17-21-436-052-1018	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.018-R-1	17-21-436-052-1019	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.019-R-1	17-21-436-052-1020	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.020-R-1	17-21-436-052-1021	3,251	248	$3,499
21-55222.021-R-1	17-21-436-052-1022	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.022-R-1	17-21-436-052-1023	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.023-R-1	17-21-436-052-1024	3,141	239	$3,380
21-55222.024-R-1	17-21-436-052-1025	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.025-R-1	17-21-436-052-1026	3,185	242	$3,427

21-55222.026-R-1	17-21-436-052-1027	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.027-R-1	17-21-436-052-1028	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.028-R-1	17-21-436-052-1029	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.029-R-1	17-21-436-052-1030	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.030-R-1	17-21-436-052-1031	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.031-R-1	17-21-436-052-1032	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.032-R-1	17-21-436-052-1033	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.033-R-1	17-21-436-052-1034	3,229	246	$3,475
21-55222.034-R-1	17-21-436-052-1035	3,340	254	$3,594
21-55222.035-R-1	17-21-436-052-1036	3,251	248	$3,499
21-55222.036-R-1	17-21-436-052-1037	3,141	239	$3,380
21-55222.037-R-1	17-21-436-052-1038	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.038-R-1	17-21-436-052-1039	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.039-R-1	17-21-436-052-1040	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.040-R-1	17-21-436-052-1041	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.041-R-1	17-21-436-052-1042	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.042-R-1	17-21-436-052-1043	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.043-R-1	17-21-436-052-1044	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.044-R-1	17-21-436-052-1045	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.045-R-1	17-21-436-052-1046	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.046-R-1	17-21-436-052-1047	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.047-R-1	17-21-436-052-1050	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.048-R-1	17-21-436-052-1051	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.049-R-1	17-21-436-052-1052	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.050-R-1	17-21-436-052-1053	3,141	239	$3,380
21-55222.051-R-1	17-21-436-052-1054	3,251	248	$3,499
21-55222.052-R-1	17-21-436-052-1055	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.053-R-1	17-21-436-052-1056	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.054-R-1	17-21-436-052-1057	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.055-R-1	17-21-436-052-1058	3,141	239	$3,380
21-55222.056-R-1	17-21-436-052-1059	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.057-R-1	17-21-436-052-1060	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.058-R-1	17-21-436-052-1061	3,141	239	$3,380
21-55222.059-R-1	17-21-436-052-1062	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.060-R-1	17-21-436-052-1063	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.061-R-1	17-21-436-052-1064	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.062-R-1	17-21-436-052-1065	3,317	253	$3,570
21-55222.063-R-1	17-21-436-052-1066	3,118	238	$3,356
21-55222.064-R-1	17-21-436-052-1067	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.065-R-1	17-21-436-052-1068	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.066-R-1	17-21-436-052-1069	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.067-R-1	17-21-436-052-1070	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.068-R-1	17-21-436-052-1071	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.069-R-1	17-21-436-052-1072	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.070-R-1	17-21-436-052-1073	3,141	239	$3,380

21-55222.071-R-1	17-21-436-052-1074	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.072-R-1	17-21-436-052-1075	3,141	239	$3,380
21-55222.073-R-1	17-21-436-052-1076	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.074-R-1	17-21-436-052-1077	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.075-R-1	17-21-436-052-1078	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.076-R-1	17-21-436-052-1079	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.077-R-1	17-21-436-052-1080	3,141	239	$3,380
21-55222.078-R-1	17-21-436-052-1081	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.079-R-1	17-21-436-052-1082	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.080-R-1	17-21-436-052-1083	3,229	246	$3,475
21-55222.081-R-1	17-21-436-052-1084	3,229	246	$3,475
21-55222.082-R-1	17-21-436-052-1085	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.083-R-1	17-21-436-052-1086	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.084-R-1	17-21-436-052-1087	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.085-R-1	17-21-436-052-1088	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.086-R-1	17-21-436-052-1089	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.087-R-1	17-21-436-052-1090	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.088-R-1	17-21-436-052-1091	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.089-R-1	17-21-436-052-1092	3,229	246	$3,475
21-55222.090-R-1	17-21-436-052-1093	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.091-R-1	17-21-436-052-1094	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.092-R-1	17-21-436-052-1095	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.093-R-1	17-21-436-052-1096	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.094-R-1	17-21-436-052-1098	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.095-R-1	17-21-436-052-1099	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.096-R-1	17-21-436-052-1100	3,163	242	$3,405
21-55222.097-R-1	17-21-436-052-1101	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.098-R-1	17-21-436-052-1102	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.099-R-1	17-21-436-052-1103	3,163	242	$3,405
21-55222.100-R-1	17-21-436-052-1104	3,207	244	$3,451
21-55222.101-R-1	17-21-436-052-1105	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.102-R-1	17-21-436-052-1106	3,185	242	$3,427
21-55222.103-R-1	17-21-436-052-1107	3,163	241	$3,404
21-55222.104-R-1	17-21-436-052-1108	3,516	269	$3,785

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 is a 78,265 square foot site located in Chicago, South Chicago Township, Cook County and is classified as a class 2-99 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance. It is improved with a 13-year-old, multi-story residential condominium building of masonry construction with 108 units.

The appellant's appeal is based on a contention of law for the 104 units that are the subject of this appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted a brief arguing two independent sales of parking spaces with a combined 1.8496% interest sold between January 1, 2018, and December 31, 2021, for $16,000 which supports a total assessment of $75,005. The appellant requested a reduction in the building's total assessment to reflect this total for the subject parcels.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of $357,036. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of $3,570,360, 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 "Condominium Analysis Results for 2021" analyzing twelve sales within the subject's building. The board of review's sales occurred from February 2018 to October 2021 for prices ranging from $26,525 to $42,066. These sales had an aggregate sale price of $443,662 and a combined ownership interest in the units sold of 11.1618% resulting in a full value of the condominium of $3,974,863. Based on the foregoing, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

The matter proceeded to hearing May 12, 2026. The appellant argued that two parking spaces each representing .9248% interest of the subject's total sold in February of 2019 for $8,000 each or $16,000 combined, totaling 1.8496% interest, which when multiplied by the total percentage of units results in a full market value of $865,052. The appellant further concluded that for the 2021 lien year the total percentage of interest for the 104 parcels was 96.3403% which calculated to $833,394. The appellant then applied a uniform debasement factor of 9% to reach the requested assessment of $75,005.

The board of review countered in their case in chief that the two sales were not listed independently on a multiple listing service and they used a special warranty deed, not a deed outright and therefore the sales were likely not arm's length which would equate to fair cash value. The board of review argued that sales of parking spaces typically occur together with condo units, not as separate transactions. The board of review further noted that only one transaction with two parcels over three years was too limited to indicate market value. The board of review presented sales involving parking spaces transferred with residential units and asserts these sales support the assessments, not reductions.

In rebuttal the appellant argued that the board of review's sales occurred between a different association and the parking association claiming it led to 200 percent interest rather than a whole 100 percent. Regarding the one sale of the two parcels, the appellant argued they were not comparable sales, as they were not sales outside the building and involved units within the association. The appellant posed as a hypothetical if an association has only three units and one sold, the one sale would not be dismissed as evidence and therefore their evidence should be viewed as a recent sale.

Conclusion of Law

The appellant has disputed the assessment of the subject property based upon a contention of law. Section 10-15 of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5- ILCS 100/10-15) provides:

> Standard of proof. Unless otherwise provided by law or stated in the agency's rules, the standard of proof in any contested case hearing conducted under this Act by an agency shall be the preponderance of the evidence.

The rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board (the Board) are silent with respect to the burden of proof associated with an argument founded on a contention of law. See 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63.
When a contention of law is raised the burden of proof is a preponderance of the evidence.

The Board notes that legal briefs are essential in legal hearings, not only for the appellant and trier of fact but also for opposing parties, as they contribute to a fair and organized process in the adversarial system. A legal brief, as defined by Ill. Admin Code, Title 86, Chapter II, Part 1910, §1910.5(b)(10), is a formal written submission that presents the legal and factual arguments of a party to an appeal, supported by citations to the record and legal authorities, and is intended to persuade the Board to adopt the party's position. In other words, it is the core of the legal argument, outlining the party's interpretation of the law and how it applies to the facts of the case. These contentions must be supported by citations to relevant facts and legal authority, including statutes, case law, and administrative rules.

Although the basis reflected in the appellant's appeal was a contention of law, and the appellant supplied a brief, in that brief and during arguments developed at hearing the de facto basis of the claim is that the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in its assessed valuation. 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 Property Tax Appeal Board may consider appeals based upon contentions of law if they are concerned with the correct assessment of the subject property. Under the burden of going forward, the contesting party must provide substantive documentary evidence or legal argument sufficient to challenge the correctness of the assessment of the subject property. Ill. Admin Code, Title 86, Chapter II, Part 1910, §1910.63(b).

The Board finds the appellant did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

Illinois law requires that all real property "shall be valued at its fair cash value, estimated at the price it would bring at a fair voluntary sale." (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1971, ch. 120, par. 501.) Fair cash value is normally associated with fair market value: what the property would bring at a voluntary sale where the owner is ready, willing and able to sell but not compelled to do so and the buyer is likewise ready, willing and able to buy, but not forced to do so. (See, *e.g., People ex rel. McGaughey v. Wilson (1937), 367 Ill. 494, 12 N.E.2d 5*.) This is theoretically an objective standard of valuation; the value of particular property is set by the forces of the marketplace at a given place and time. Comparable sales are used when there is no valid recent subject sale, the subject sale is not arm's-length, multiple sales are needed to demonstrate uniformity, or the appellant wishes to show the assessment is inconsistent with similar properties. Recent sales of the subject or within the subject are typically considered the best evidence of market value if the sale is: arm's-length, voluntary, exposed to the open market, between unrelated parties, and supported by documentation such as a listing, affidavits, or testimony. One valid arm's-length sale of the subject property can be sufficient to establish market value. However, if the sale is not arm's-length, not publicly marketed, between related entities, lacking party testimony, or on a lesser deed type (e.g., special warranty deed), it may be rejected as unreliable.

The Board finds the subject's lack of open market exposure fails to meet a fundamental requirement to be considered an arm's-length transaction reflective of fair cash value, as well as the lack of documentation regarding other aspects of the sale such as a settlement statement from the sale of the subject property, evidence that the sale of the subject was not due to a foreclosure proceeding, that the parties to the transaction were not related, or that the subject was sold by owner.

The Board gives little weight to the 9% uniform debasement factor applied to the total consideration of the sales prices in the analysis as appellant failed to establish any substantive evidence to apply anything other than the level of assessment set forth in the Cook County Ordinance for class 2-99 property of 10%.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value in the record to be the sales submitted by the board of review. These were sales within the subject, sold proximately in time to the assessment date at issue, and sold for prices ranging from $26,525 to $42,066. This results in a full value of the condominium of $3,974,863 or a total assessment for the building of $397,486, which is above the current assessment. The Board cannot give weight to the appellant's single sale of two parcels as it did not have the elements of an arm's length transaction, it was transferred by a special warranty deed and cannot be said to be a transaction between a willing seller and a willing buyer on this record. Based on this record the Board finds the subject's assessment is reflective of market value 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:

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

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: September 15, 2026

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

Santa Fe Garden V Parking Condo Assoc., by attorney:
Angel Carpio
Worsek & Vihon LLP
180 N. LaSalle Street
Suite 3010
Chicago, IL 60601

COUNTY

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