



FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Sloan Kodroff
DOCKET NO.: 23-28107.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 02-13-106-006-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Sloan Kodroff, the appellant, by Andreas Mamalakis, attorney-at-law of the Law Offices of Andreas Mamalakis in Kenosha, Wisconsin, 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: \$6,666
IMPR.: \$22,919
TOTAL: \$29,585

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 2023 tax year. The Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of the appeal.¹

Findings of Fact

The subject property is improved with a one-story dwelling of frame construction containing 1,521 square feet of living area. The dwelling is approximately 60 years old. Features of the property include a partial basement with a formal recreation room, central air conditioning, 2½ bathrooms, and a 2-car garage. The property has an 8,333 square foot site located in Palatine, Palatine Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-03 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant contends inequity regarding the improvement assessment as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted information and copies of photographs on five equity comparables composed of class 2-03 properties improved with one-

¹ The appellant's counsel originally requested a hearing before the Property Tax Appeal Board but subsequently withdrew the request for a hearing.

story dwellings of frame construction that range in size from 1,248 to 1,788 square feet of living area. The homes range in age from 56 to 65 years old. Two comparables have partial basements, two comparables have slab foundations, and one comparable has a crawl space foundation. Each property has one or two fireplaces, a 1-car or 2-car garage, and 1½, 2, or 2½ bathrooms. Four comparables have central air conditioning. These properties have the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject property and are located from .16 to .82 of a mile from the subject property. Their improvement assessments range from \$16,045 to \$22,100 or from \$11.62 to \$13.00 per square foot of living area. The appellant requested the subject's improvement assessment be reduced to \$18,845.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$29,585. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$22,919 or \$15.07 per square foot of living area. In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information and copies of photographs on four equity comparables consisting of class 2-03 properties improved with one-story dwellings of frame construction that range in size from 1,248 to 1,521 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 54 to 60 years old. Each property has a full or partial basement with a formal recreation room, central air conditioning, 1½ or 2½ bathrooms, and a 2-car garage. These properties have the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject property and are located in the same block, "subarea" or ¼ of a mile from the subject property. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from \$19,356 to \$27,301 or from \$15.51 to \$17.95 per square foot of living area.

Conclusion of Law

The appellant 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 Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be board of review comparables #1, #2 and #3 that are most similar to the subject property in size and features. Copies of photographs of these three comparables also depict homes that are very similar to the subject in design. Board of review comparables #1, #2 and #3 have improvement assessments that range from \$25,280 to \$27,301 or from \$16.69 to \$17.95 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$22,919 or \$15.07 per square foot of living area falls below the range established by the best comparables in this record. Less weight is given the remaining comparables submitted by the parties due to differences from the subject in dwelling size, foundation, garage area, bathroom count, fireplace amenity, and/or lack of central air conditioning. Based on this record 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: _____

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:

January 20, 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

Sloan Kodroff, by attorney:
Andreas Mamalakis
Law Offices of Andreas Mamalakis
4844 89th Place
Kenosha, WI 53142

COUNTY

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