



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

APPELLANT: Candace Achterberch
DOCKET NO.: 23-50438.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 24-18-308-003-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Candace Achterberch, the appellant, by Robert Rosenfeld, attorney at law of Robert H. Rosenfeld & Associates, LLC in Northbrook, 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: \$4,111
IMPR.: \$14,888
TOTAL: \$18,999

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.

Findings of Fact

The subject property is improved with a 1.5-story dwelling of frame and masonry exterior construction containing 1,229 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1951 and is approximately 72 years old. Features of the property include a full basement, 1½ bathrooms and a 2-car garage. The property has a 7,150 square foot site located in Worth, Worth Township, Cook County. The subject is 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 on four equity comparables consisting of class 2-03 properties improved with 1-story or 1.5-story dwellings of masonry or frame and masonry exterior construction that range in size from 1,252 to 1,418 square feet of living area. The homes are 61 to 72 years old. Three comparables have full

basements and one comparable has a crawl space foundation. Each comparable has 1 or 1½ bathrooms and a 1½-car or 2-car garage. One comparable has one fireplace. These properties have the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject property and are located from .1 of a mile to 1 mile from the subject property. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$13,055 to \$15,379 or from \$10.43 to \$11.28 per square foot of living area. The appellant requested the subject's improvement assessment be reduced to \$13,322.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$18,999. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$14,888 or \$12.11 per square foot of living area. In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on three equity comparables consisting of class 2-03 properties improved with one-story dwellings of masonry or frame and masonry exterior construction that range in size from 1,222 to 1,231 square feet of living area.¹ The dwellings are 46 to 68 years old. Each property has a full basement and 1 or 1½ bathrooms. One comparable has central air conditioning. One comparable has a 1-car garage, one comparable has a 1½-car garage, and one comparable has a 2-car garage. The comparables have the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject property and are located ¼ of a mile from the subject. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from \$15,135 to \$19,805 or from \$12.29 to \$16.13 per square foot of living area. The board of review contends the building assessed value per square foot for all the comparables are equal or higher than the subject, which supports the 2023 assessed value as equitable.

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 parties submitted information on seven equity comparables with the same classification code and neighborhood code as the subject property to support their respective positions. The subject home is described as a 1.5-story dwelling while six comparables are 1-story dwellings, which does detract from their similarity to the subject property. Nevertheless, the Board gives less weight to appellant's comparables #2 and #4 due to differences from the subject in dwelling size with homes being approximately 15% and 11% larger than the subject dwelling, respectively. The Board gives less weight to appellant's comparable #3 due to differences from the subject in foundation as this property has a crawl space foundation whereas the subject property has a full basement. The Board gives less weight to board of review comparable #1 as this property is improved with a dwelling that is approximately 26 years newer than the subject dwelling. The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be appellant's comparable #1 and board of

¹ The board of review grid analysis listed four comparables, however, comparables #1 and #4 are duplicate properties.

review comparables #2 and #3 that are improved with dwellings that range in size from 1,222 to 1,252 square feet of living area and in age from 63 to 68 years old. The comparables have varying degrees of similarity to the subject in features that would require adjustments to make them more equivalent to the subject property. Each comparable has $\frac{1}{2}$ less bathroom than the subject indicating an upward adjustment to each comparable would be appropriate for this difference. Board of review comparables #2 and #3 have smaller garages than the subject indicating upward adjustments to these comparables for this difference would be proper. Conversely, board of review comparable #3 has central air conditioning, unlike the subject, necessitating a downward adjustment to the comparable to make it more equivalent to the subject for this difference. These three comparables have improvement assessments that range from \$13,055 to \$15,263 or from \$10.43 to \$12.49 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$14,888 or \$12.11 per square foot of living area falls within the range established by the best comparables in this record. Based on this record, after considering the appropriate 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.

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:

April 21, 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

Candace Achterberch, by attorney:
Robert Rosenfeld
Robert H. Rosenfeld & Associates, LLC
40 Skokie Blvd
Suite 150
Northbrook, IL 60062

COUNTY

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