



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

APPELLANT: Christopher Marzec  
DOCKET NO.: 22-20732.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 12-13-301-095-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Christopher Marzec, the appellant, by attorney Stephanie Park, of Park & Longstreet, P.C., in Inverness, 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:** \$6,448  
**IMPR.:** \$40,552  
**TOTAL:** \$47,000

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 2022 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 dwelling of masonry exterior construction with 2,606 square feet of living area and which is approximately 77 years old. Features include a full basement, central air conditioning, and a two-car garage. The property has a 4,960 square foot site and is located in Norridge, Norwood Park Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-06 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 comparables located in the same neighborhood code as the subject. The comparables consist of class 2-06 two-story dwellings of masonry or frame and masonry exterior construction which range in age from 66 to 79 years old. The dwellings range in size from 2,587 to 2,688 square



feet of living area. Two homes each have a full basement, and two homes each have crawl-space foundations. Three dwellings have central air conditioning, two homes each have a fireplace, and three comparables each have a two-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$28,637 to \$36,891 or from \$11.01 to \$14.26 per square foot of living area.

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduced improvement assessment of \$28,692 or \$11.01 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 \$47,000. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$40,552 or \$15.56 per square foot of living area.

As part of the grid analysis, the subject property was reportedly sold in February 2019, 34 months prior to the lien date at issue, for \$467,000.

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 as the subject and the same block, subarea, or ¼ of a mile from the subject. The comparables consist of class 2-06 two-story dwellings of masonry exterior construction which range in age from 64 to 92 years old. The dwellings range in size from 2,539 to 2,762 square feet of living area. The comparables have full basements, central air conditioning, comparable #2 has a fireplace, and three comparables each have a two-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$43,032 to \$53,164 or from \$15.62 to \$20.94 per square foot of living area.

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

In rebuttal, the appellant contends that the board of review comparables are superior properties in bathroom count, bedroom count, room count, basement finish, fireplace feature, and/or sold for prices of 23% and 48% more than the subject property. The appellant also contends that the submission by the board of review was insufficient under procedural rule 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(c).

### **Conclusion of Law**

As an initial matter, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that the board of review's presentation of data on four equity comparables in response to this lack of assessment equity appeal is sufficient evidence to meet the board of review's burden in responding to the equity appeal. (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(c)).

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 suggested equity comparables to support their respective positions before the Property Tax Appeal Board. The Board has given reduced weight to appellant's comparables #1, #2 and #3 as well as board of review comparables #2 and #4, due to differences in foundation type, age, lack of air conditioning and/or lack of a garage when compared to the subject and other comparables in the record which are more similar to the subject in these characteristics.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity in the record consists of the appellant's comparable #4 along with board of review comparables #1 and #3, which are each relatively similar to the subject in classification, story height, foundation type, and some features. The Board finds the comparables necessitate adjustments for differences in age, and/or dwelling size when compared to the subject. These best comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$36,891 to \$43,143 or from \$14.26 to \$16.44 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$40,552 or \$15.56 per square foot of living area is within the range of the best comparables in the record both in terms of overall improvement assessment and on a per-square-foot of living area basis.

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 from the subject to make the comparables more similar 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: \_\_\_\_\_

October 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

Christopher Marzec, by attorney:  
Stephanie Park  
Park & Longstreet, P.C.  
1620 W Colonial Pkwy.  
Inverness, IL 60067

COUNTY

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