



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

APPELLANT: 2840-42 Francisco Co-op Association  
DOCKET NO.: 08-26421.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 13-25-134-022-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are 2840-42 Francisco Co-op Association, the appellant, by attorney John P. Fitzgerald, of Fitzgerald Law Group, P.C. in Chicago; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, 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:** \$ 14,364  
**IMPR.:** \$ 120,098  
**TOTAL:** \$ 134,462

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property consists of an 86-year old, three-story, residential cooperative property situated on a 6,300 square foot site. The appellant argued that there was unequal treatment in the assessment process as the basis of this appeal.

In support of this equity argument, the appellant submitted assessment data and limited descriptions for the subject property and four suggested comparable cooperatives. The data for the four suggested comparables reflects that the properties are between 36 and 93 years-old and are located within four miles of the subject. These suggested comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$26,499 to \$114,950. The appellant failed to provide the square footage of living area

for the subject or comparables. Based on this analysis, the appellant requested a reduction in the assessment.

The board of review submitted "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's improvement assessment was \$120,098. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review also submitted a multiple-page document entitled 'Park Forest Cooperative Undervaluation Complaints - Tax Year 2005'. The document's caption read: Village of Park Forest, Taxing District, Bloom Township v. Park Forest Co-Op, Ash Street Cooperative and Cedarwood Cooperative, as Taxpayers. This document is an opinion from the board of review on techniques for valuing residential cooperative property. As a result of its analysis, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

After considering the evidence and reviewing the record, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal.

Appellants who object to an assessment on the basis of lack of uniformity bear the burden of proving the disparity of assessment valuations by clear and convincing evidence. Kankakee County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 131 Ill. 2d 1, 544 N.E.2d 762 (1989). The evidence must demonstrate a consistent pattern of assessment inequities within the assessment jurisdiction. Proof of assessment inequity should include assessment data and documentation establishing the physical, locational, and jurisdictional similarities of the suggested comparables to the subject property. Property Tax Appeal Board Rule 1910.65(b). Mathematical equality in the assessment process is not required. A practical uniformity, rather than an absolute one is the test. Apex Motor Fuel Co. v. Barrett, 20 Ill. 2d 395, 169 N.E.2d 769 (1960). Having considered the evidence presented, the PTAB concludes that the appellant has not met this burden and that a reduction is not warranted.

The Board finds that the appellant failed to submit sufficient evidence to determine if the subject property was over assessed. Although the comparables presented by the appellant are similar in location and are classified as cooperatives, the appellant failed to submit several key elements to comparability: square footage of living area, number of units, type of construction, type of design, descriptions of the units, the number of building share, and shares per unit. Therefore, the Board is unable to determine comparability to the subject property.

As a result of this analysis, the Board further finds that the appellant has not adequately demonstrated that the subject was inequitably assessed by clear and convincing evidence and that a reduction is not 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.

*Ronald R. Crit*

Chairman

*K. L. Fan*

Member

*Richard A. Huff*

Member

*Mario M. Lino*

Member

*J. R.*

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: February 21, 2014

*Allen Castrovillari*

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 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 the subsequent year 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.

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.