



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

APPELLANT: Clarksville Station Condo Assn
DOCKET NO.: 22-42046.001-R-1 through 22-42046.032-R-1
PARCEL NO.: See Below

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Clarksville Station Condo Assn, the appellant(s), by attorney Timothy C. Jacobs, of Kovitz Shifrin Nesbit 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 **A Reduction** 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
22-42046.001-R-1	14-20-426-054-1001	5,687	26,442	\$32,129
22-42046.002-R-1	14-20-426-054-1002	6,930	32,224	\$39,154
22-42046.003-R-1	14-20-426-054-1003	5,941	27,619	\$33,560
22-42046.004-R-1	14-20-426-054-1004	7,782	36,185	\$43,967
22-42046.005-R-1	14-20-426-054-1005	5,941	27,619	\$33,560
22-42046.006-R-1	14-20-426-054-1006	7,782	36,185	\$43,967
22-42046.007-R-1	14-20-426-054-1007	5,595	26,014	\$31,609
22-42046.008-R-1	14-20-426-054-1008	6,401	29,761	\$36,162
22-42046.009-R-1	14-20-426-054-1009	6,009	27,942	\$33,951
22-42046.010-R-1	14-20-426-054-1010	6,677	31,046	\$37,723
22-42046.011-R-1	14-20-426-054-1011	5,987	27,833	\$33,820
22-42046.012-R-1	14-20-426-054-1012	7,852	36,505	\$44,357
22-42046.013-R-1	14-20-426-054-1013	5,987	27,833	\$33,820
22-42046.014-R-1	14-20-426-054-1014	7,852	36,505	\$44,357
22-42046.015-R-1	14-20-426-054-1015	6,401	29,761	\$36,162
22-42046.016-R-1	14-20-426-054-1016	6,769	31,474	\$38,243
22-42046.017-R-1	14-20-426-054-1017	5,780	26,870	\$32,650
22-42046.018-R-1	14-20-426-054-1018	6,724	31,259	\$37,983
22-42046.019-R-1	14-20-426-054-1019	5,941	27,619	\$33,560
22-42046.020-R-1	14-20-426-054-1020	7,898	36,719	\$44,617
22-42046.021-R-1	14-20-426-054-1021	5,848	27,192	\$33,040
22-42046.022-R-1	14-20-426-054-1022	7,898	36,719	\$44,617
22-42046.023-R-1	14-20-426-054-1023	6,401	29,761	\$36,162
22-42046.024-R-1	14-20-426-054-1024	6,309	29,333	\$35,642
22-42046.025-R-1	14-20-426-054-1025	6,493	30,189	\$36,682

22-42046.026-R-1	14-20-426-054-1026	6,516	30,296	\$36,812
22-42046.027-R-1	14-20-426-054-1027	5,756	26,764	\$32,520
22-42046.028-R-1	14-20-426-054-1028	7,621	35,435	\$43,056
22-42046.029-R-1	14-20-426-054-1029	5,756	26,764	\$32,520
22-42046.030-R-1	14-20-426-054-1030	8,174	38,004	\$46,178
22-42046.031-R-1	14-20-426-054-1031	5,964	27,726	\$33,690
22-42046.032-R-1	14-20-426-054-1032	6,632	30,831	\$37,463

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 32 condominium units in a 23-year-old condominium complex of masonry construction. The property also consists of approximately 34 individually owned parking spaces.¹ The property has a 15,000 square foot site and is located in Chicago, Lakeview Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-99 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant's appeal is based on overvaluation. The appellant contends that the appeal is of the condominium units only, not parking spaces or land. In support of this argument the appellant submitted evidence including a condominium analysis based on the sale of 12 units in the subject property complex. The 12 units in the analysis sold for a total of \$4,891,038 and this included land and parking spaces. These 12 units represented a 37.6% ownership in the complex. Appellant asserts that the total market value of the complex based on these factors, as well as a 91.77% common ownership, is \$11,937,510, which would reflect a total assessment for the complex of \$1,193,751. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$1,227,544. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$12,275,440.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on a condominium analysis based on the sales of 12 condominium units and 12 parking spaces. The board of review asserts that the appellant's analysis is incorrect because the majority of sales in the complex have included a condominium and parking space, not a condominium unit alone. The board of review asserted that the 24 total sales totaled \$4,891,026. At 37.6% ownership for

¹ The board of review's notes on appeal disclose 66 units within the subject, however, a review shows there are only 65 units listed for a total percentage of ownership of 97.71%.

the appealed units this reflects a total market value of the complex of \$13,008,048. This amount, using a 91.77% percentage of ownership for residential units under appeal, results in a fair market value of \$11,937,486, reflecting a total assessment of \$1,193,749. Based on this evidence the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

Conclusion of Law

The appellant contends the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in its assessed valuation. When market value is the basis of the appeal the value of the property must be proved by a preponderance of the evidence. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). 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 Board finds the appellant met this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The appellant asserted that the assessment of the residential condominium units in the subject property complex were overvalued in the assessment process. The appellant is not appealing the valuation of the parking spaces or the land in the complex. The appellant presented evidence of recent sales in the complex to carry out a condominium analysis. In their analysis the appellant utilize the total sale prices of the units, including parking spaces, for a total of 12 sales covering 24 units, and then subtracted the value of the parking spaces, based on ownership percentage of the parking spaces, to arrive at their asserted fair market value of the 12 residential condominium units upon which to base their valuation of the entire building.

Both parties used the same sales in estimating the subject's market value. The difference in each party's argument lies in the differences in the total percentage of ownership used. Both parties find a total value for the subject of approximately \$13,008,080. The subject building has a total percentage of ownership of 97.71%. The current assessment is based from a percentage of ownership of 100% which artificially inflates the market value.

The Board finds that the appellant has met their burden by a preponderance of the evidence of overvaluation in the assessment process. Based on this a reduction in the improvement assessment of the appealed residential unit PIN's commensurate with the request of the appellant is warranted.

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: _____

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

Clarksville Station Condo Assn, by attorney:
Timothy C. Jacobs
Kovitz Shifrin Nesbit
640 N. La Salle Drive
Suite 495
Chicago, IL 60654

COUNTY

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