



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

APPELLANT: Matthew Turk
DOCKET NO.: 22-42090.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 03-20-426-009-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Matthew Turk, the appellant, by attorney Dora Cornelio, of Schmidt Salzman & Moran, Ltd. 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: \$7,616
IMPR.: \$74,384
TOTAL: \$82,000

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 2-story dwelling of frame and masonry exterior construction with 3,724 square feet of living area. The dwelling is 25 years old. Features of the home include a full basement,¹ central air conditioning, a fireplace and a 2-car garage. The property has a 9,520 square foot site and is located in Arlington Heights, Wheeling Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-78 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant contends assessment inequity with respect to the improvement as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted information on five comparables

¹ The appellant described the subject's basement as having a recreation room whereas the board of review described the subject as having an unfinished basement area. Neither party provided additional documentary evidence to support their respective descriptions of the subject property.

located within the same assessment neighborhood as the subject. Three comparables are located within the subject's subarea according to the PINs beginning with #03-20. The comparables consist of class 2-78, 2-story dwellings of masonry or frame and masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 3,588 to 3,761 square feet of living area. The dwellings are 23 to 34 years old. Each comparable has a full basement with finished area, central air conditioning, 1 or 2 fireplaces and either a 2-car or a 3-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$46,218 to \$67,711 or \$12.76 to \$18.87 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested that the improvement assessment be reduced.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$82,000. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$74,384 or \$19.97 per square foot of living 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, the subject's subarea (according to PINs beginning with #03-20), and approximately ¼ of a mile from the subject. Two comparables are also located along the same street as the subject. The comparables consist of class 2-78, 2-story dwellings of frame, masonry or frame and masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 3,441 to 3,749 square feet of living area. The dwellings are 7 to 31 years old. Each comparable has a full unfinished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace and either a 2-car or a 3-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$71,186 to \$84,467 or from \$20.69 to \$23.66 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 record contains a total of nine equity comparables for the Board's consideration. The Board gives less weight to the appellant's comparables #1 and #2 which according to the PINs are located within a different subarea (PINs beginning #03-16) than the subject property (PIN beginning #03-20). The Board also gives less weight to the board of review's comparable #2 due to its considerably newer age when compared to the subject dwelling.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be the appellant's comparables #3, #4 and #5 as well as the board of review's comparables which are relatively similar to the subject in location, age, dwelling size and some features. These seven comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$49,750 to \$83,282 or from \$13.79 to \$22.51 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$74,384 or \$19.97 per square foot of living area falls within the range established by the best comparables in the record. After considering

adjustments to the best comparables for differences from 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.

The constitutional provision for uniformity of taxation and valuation does not require mathematical equality. 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 the 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.

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

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 17, 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

Matthew Turk, by attorney:
Dora Cornelio
Schmidt Salzman & Moran, Ltd.
111 W. Washington St.
Suite 1300
Chicago, IL 60602

COUNTY

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