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

APPELLANT: Lyubomir Alexandrov
DOCKET NO.: 24-41213.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 20-33-208-050-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Lyubomir Alexandrov, the appellant(s); 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:

| | |
|---|---|
| **LAND:** | $649 |
| **IMPR.:** | $3,071 |
| **TOTAL:** | $3,720 |

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 2024 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, townhome dwelling with 1,240 square feet of living area. The dwelling is constructed of masonry and is approximately 61 years old. Features of the home include one full and one-half bathroom and a full basement. The property has a 1,297 square foot site located in the City of Chicago within Lake Township, Cook County. The appellant failed to report whether the subject is owner-occupied. The subject is classified 2-95 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant contends that the subject property is overvalued and, in support of this position, submitted three comparable sales of townhome properties that share the same neighborhood code as the subject and are located within the same complex. Each comparable sale is accompanied by documentation of the sale information.

Comparable Property 1 sold in April 2024 for $20,000 and contains 1,240 square feet of living area, resulting in a sale price of approximately $16.13 per square foot, including land. Comparable Property 2 sold in December 2022 for $40,000 and contains 1,240 square feet of living area, reflecting a sale price of approximately $32.26 per square foot, including land. Comparable Property 3 sold in March 2024 for $40,000 and contains 961 square feet of living area, resulting in a sale price of approximately $41.62 per square foot, including land.

The appellant asserts that these sales represent market values within the subject property's immediate area during the relevant period and collectively demonstrate that the subject property is over assessed for the lien year under appeal.

Based upon the submitted evidence, the appellant requests that the subject property total assessment be reduced to $3,720.

The Board of Review submitted its Notes on Appeal, reporting an assessment of $6,201 for the subject property. This assessment reflects an implied market value of $62,010, or $44.77 per square foot of living area, land included, when applying the 10 percent level of assessment for Class 2 property.

In support of the correctness of the assessment, the Board of Review submitted four comparable sales of residential properties. Each of the submitted comparable properties have a different neighborhood code than the subject and the proximity of Comparable Properties to the subject was not reported. Comparable Property 1 sold in November 2024 for $312,000 and contains 1,122 square feet of living area, resulting in a sale price of approximately $278.07 per square foot, which reflects the total sale price inclusive of land. Comparable Property 2 sold in April 2024 for $137,800 and contains 1,120 square feet of living area, reflecting a sale price of approximately $123.04 per square foot, inclusive of land. Comparable Property 3 sold in March 2024 for $206,000 and contains 1,134 square feet of living area, yielding a sale price of approximately $181.66 per square foot, inclusive of land. Comparable Property 4 sold in April 2023 for $155,000 and contains 1,320 square feet of living area, resulting in a sale price of approximately $117.42 per square foot, inclusive of land.

Based on the submitted evidence, the Board of Review contends that the subject property's current assessment is equitable and falls within the range established by comparable properties. Accordingly, the Board requests confirmation of the subject's existing assessment.

The appellant submitted rebuttal evidence which focused primarily on demonstrating that the Board of Review's four comparable sales are not reliable indicators of the subject's market value. The appellant asserts that each BOR comparable is located in a different neighborhood and are substantially renovated, while the subject property has not been updated in over sixty years. The appellant further notes that Comparable 1 consists of two rehabbed units sold together and therefore cannot be compared to a single townhouse. In addition, the appellant points out errors in assessor property record cards for multiple units in the subject's complex, including incorrect designations of one-story structures and attics, which the appellant states do not exist. Overall, the rebuttal emphasizes that the BOR comparables differ from the subject in location, condition, and structural characteristics, making them unsuitable benchmarks for valuation.

## Hearing

This matter proceeded to hearing on May 5, 2026, via the WebEx platform. Participating in the hearing were Mr. and Mrs. Alexandrov, appellant, and Rachel Dickerson, representative for the Cook County Board of Review. The parties were sworn in as witnesses.

During testimony, the appellant described the subject property as a two-story masonry townhome containing 1,240 square feet of living area and approximately 61 years of age. He stated that the property is located within Neighborhood Code 260 in Lake Township and has never been updated, retaining its original kitchen, bathrooms, and interior finishes. The appellant further testified that the dwelling is uninhabitable due to nonfunctioning plumbing, repeated basement flooding, and mold, and he explained that the absence of a homeowners' association has contributed to deteriorated exterior conditions throughout the complex. He also noted that none of the Board of Review's comparable sales were from the subject's townhouse complex or neighborhood and that those properties were significantly renovated. As a result, he relied on three comparable sales located within the same complex, sharing the same building class and neighborhood code, and identified them as the most reliable indicators of market value for the subject property. The appellant reaffirmed his request for a reduction in the assessment based on this evidence.

The Board of Review representative, Rachel Dickerson, provided limited testimony. She indicated that the Board had no questions for the appellant and stated that the Board would rest on its previously submitted evidence. Dickerson emphasized that the appellant did not submit the documentation required to support a vacancy claim, including dated photographs and a vacancy affidavit, and stated that vacancy could not be considered without such materials. Other than these remarks, the Board of Review presented no further testimony or additional evidence at the hearing.

## Conclusion of Law

The taxpayer asserts that 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 taxpayer must prove the value of the property by a preponderance of the evidence. 86 Ill. Admin. Code §1910.63(e); Winnebago County Bd. of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Bd., 313 Ill. App. 3d 1038, 1043 (2d Dist. 2000). 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 on this basis is warranted.

The parties submitted a total of seven Class 2-95 comparable sale properties. The Board has reviewed all the evidence and assigns greater weight to those properties most similar in proximity, size, age, and physical characteristics to the subject. After evaluating the testimony and documentation submitted, the Board finds that the appellant has met the required burden of proof. A reduction in the subject's assessment is therefore warranted.

As a preliminary matter, the Board notes that although the appellant offered testimony concerning the subject's vacancy and deteriorated condition, he ultimately relied on three comparable sales from within the same townhouse complex as the basis of his overvaluation claim. The appellant provided no statutory authority supporting a reduction due to vacancy, and vacancy alone does not warrant a reduction under 35 ILCS 200/9-180. The appellant did not demonstrate that the subject's vacancy had any effect on its market value during the lien year. Accordingly, the Board finds that a reduction based on vacancy is not warranted and gives no weight to testimony concerning vacancy or condition for the lien year under appeal.

The Board finds that the most persuasive evidence regarding the subject property's assessment consists of the appellant's Comparable Properties Nos. 1 through 3. These townhome units are all located within the same complex as the subject, share the same building class and neighborhood code, and possess physical characteristics similar to the subject dwelling. In contrast, the four comparable sales submitted by the Board of Review are located in different neighborhoods, are not within the subject's complex, and exhibit materially different conditions, with several fully renovated and one consisting of two units sold together. The Board notes that the BOR did not provide the precise proximity of its comparables to the subject property, and the differences in location, neighborhood code, and similarities to the subject reduce their reliability as indicators of the subject's market value.

Based on the totality of the evidence, the Board concludes that the appellant has demonstrated, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the subject property is overvalued. Accordingly, a reduction in the subject's assessment 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: ______________________ ______________________

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: 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

Lyubomir Alexandrov
P.O. Box 471
Elmhurst, IL 60126

COUNTY

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