



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

APPELLANT: Lori Rozdolsky  
DOCKET NO.: 17-03333.001-R-2  
PARCEL NO.: 16-04-102-019

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Lori Rozdolsky, the appellant, by attorney Craig J. Donnewald, of Finkel Martwick & Colson, PC in Chicago, and the Lake 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 **Lake** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

**LAND:** \$192,793  
**IMPR.:** \$632,019  
**TOTAL:** \$824,812

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**Statement of Jurisdiction**

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Lake County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2017 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 1.75-story dwelling<sup>1</sup> of brick and stone exterior construction with 7,849 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 2001. Features of the home include a full finished basement<sup>2</sup> with a rec room, bar area, game room, workout area, media room, bedroom and two full bathrooms. The home includes central air conditioning, five fireplaces,<sup>3</sup> a cabana with full bathroom and kitchenette area,<sup>4</sup> an inground swimming pool and a

---

<sup>1</sup> Although within the appraisal the appraisers describe the dwelling as a two-story home, the schematic drawing in the report and the assessing officials depict a 1 ¾ style dwelling.

<sup>2</sup> The appellant's appraisers report a 4,032 square foot basement that is 100% finished; the assessing officials report the same basement size but report only 520 square feet of finished basement area.

<sup>3</sup> The assessing officials report three fireplaces, but the appellant and the appellant's appraiser both reported a total of five fireplaces.

<sup>4</sup> The subject's property record card as submitted by the board of review fails to identify the cabana or a "bathhouse" as an improvement of the subject parcel.

741 square foot garage. The property has a 62,726 square foot site and is located in Lake Forest, West Deerfield Township, Lake County.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted an appraisal prepared by Michele Mayers and supervised by Edward V. Kling. The appraisal was prepared for purposes of a real estate tax appeal using fee simple rights and based on the sales comparison approach to value estimated the subject property had a market value of \$1,900,000 as of January 1, 2017.

Mayers reported that she inspected the subject property on September 14, 2016 and then viewed the subject from the public street on September 11, 2017. The appraiser presumes the property to be in the same condition as of the valuation date and in the Addendum reported the appraisal was prepared by a drive-by (exterior only inspection). In addition to the previous viewing, information was gathered through telephone conversations with the owner, MLS or copy of a prior appraisal report which was assumed to be correct. While the appraiser found the dwelling to be well maintained and in good condition, the homeowner reported the roof needs to be replaced as it is worn, and leaks needs to be fixed. In addition, there are loose stones around the patio and pool area. In addition, at page 5 of the Addendum, there is a "special note" regarding property inspection. The appraisers further reported having appraised the subject property "in September 2016." (See USPAP Addendum).

In the sales comparison approach to value, the appraisers analyzed five comparable sales located from .37 to 2.63-miles from the subject property. The appraisers reported there were limited similar sales data available for consideration, but despite differences, the appraiser reported the comparables "appear to be similar in appeal, utility and marketability." The parcels range in size from 60,112 to 79,279 square feet of land area with a residential view. Each parcel has been improved with either a "traditional" or an "English" style dwelling of stone, brick, brick and stone, brick and stucco or brick and Dryvit exterior construction. The homes were 15 to 56 years old and range in size from 4,149 to 7,887 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a full or partial basement, one of which is an English-style and four of which have finished areas. Comparable #1 was deemed by the appraisers to be in superior condition whereas the subject and each of the remaining comparables were in "good" condition. Each dwelling has central air conditioning, three to six fireplaces, and three-car or four-car garages. Four comparables each have inground swimming pools and one comparable also has a cabana. The comparables sold from March 2015 to December 2016 for prices ranging from \$1,450,000 to \$2,150,000 or from \$202.21 to \$349.48 per square foot of living area, including land.

The appraisers made adjustments to the comparables for differences when compared to the subject as detailed on pages 2 and 3 of the Addendum. Differences included adjustments for land size, quality of construction, age, condition, bathrooms, dwelling size, basement style, basement finish, garage size, number of fireplaces and/or other differences such as porch/patio, pool and cabana amenities. From this process, the appraisers concluded adjusted sales prices ranging from \$1,736,545 to \$2,185,655 or from \$234.10 to \$461.54 per square foot of living area, including land. The appraisers contend that all of the comparables represent "a reasonable range in value and were all given consideration when determining value."

Based on the foregoing data and analysis, the appraisers estimated a market value for the subject property as of January 1, 2017 of \$1,900,000 or \$242.08 per square foot of living area, including land.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$824,812. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$2,488,121 or \$317.00 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the 2017 three year average median level of assessment for Lake County of 33.15% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales, where board of review comparable #2 is the same property as appellant's appraisal sale #3. The board of review also supplied copies of property record cards for the subject and each of its comparables which reveal some additional amenities that were not depicted within the grid analysis filed in this proceeding. The comparables are located from .39 to 1.625-miles from the subject property. The parcels range in size from 50,530 to 109,771 square feet of land area and have been improved with either a 1.75-story, a part 1.5-story and part 1-story, or two, 2-story dwellings of brick exterior construction. The homes were built between 2001 and 2004 and range in size from 7,086 to 8,405 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a basement, two of which have finished areas. The dwellings feature central air conditioning, three to six fireplaces and a garage ranging in size from 816 to 1,175 square feet of building area. Comparables #1 and #2 each have inground swimming pools and comparable #1 has a bathhouse and a tennis court. The comparables sold from March 2015 to July 2017 for prices ranging from \$2,575,000 to \$3,333,000 or from \$272.60 to \$451.59 per square foot of living area, including land.

Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

### **Conclusion of Law**

The appellant contends 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 value of the property must be proved by a preponderance of the evidence. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). 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 did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The appellant submitted an appraisal of the subject property and the board of review submitted four suggested comparable sales, one of which was contained within the appraisal report, in order to support their respective positions before the Property Tax Appeal Board.

The Board has thoroughly examined the appellant's appraisal and finds it troubling that the final opinion of the value for the subject falls only slightly above the range of the adjusted sales prices in the appraisal report. Under the principle that adjustments are made to the comparables to make them each more similar to the subject, logic would dictate that, absent another significant factor(s), that the final opinion of value would typically fall more within the range of the adjusted sale prices on a per-square-foot basis. Moreover, the adjusted sale price of appraisal

sale #4 is significantly higher than any of the other properties in the appraisal report and this dwelling is significantly older and smaller than the subject property. In summary, having examined the appraisal report and all sales data in the record, the Board finds as a result that the appraisers' final value conclusion is not a credible or a reliable indicator of the subject's estimated market value as of January 1, 2017 given the factors outlined above. Therefore, the Board will examine the raw sales data contained in the record.

The record contains a total of eight comparables sales, with one common property. Less weight has been given to appraisal sale #5 and board of review comparables #3 and #4; as noted previously, appraisal sale #5 is significantly different from the subject in dwelling size and age and board of review comparables #3 and #4 each lack a pool and/or cabana amenity which are features of the subject property.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the appraisal sales #1 through #4 submitted by the appellant along with board of review comparable sales #1, #2 and #3, where there is one common property. These comparables have varying degrees of similarity to the subject. The Board recognizes that the sale price of board of review comparable #1 is significantly higher than any of the other sales in the record and thus, may be somewhat of an outlier and presents a significantly larger dwelling with significant finished basement area and a tennis court. These five comparable sales sold between March 2015 and July 2017 for prices ranging from \$1,500,000 to \$3,333,000 or from \$202.21 to \$396.55 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$2,488,121 or \$317.00 per square foot of living area, including land, which is within the range established by the best comparable sales in the record. The common comparable presented by the parties is most similar to the subject and had the fewest adjustments by the appellant's appraisers depicting an adjusted sale price of \$277.12 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this evidence and after considering adjustments to the comparables for differences in age, size and/or features, the Board finds 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: October 20, 2020



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

Lori Rozdolsky, by attorney:  
Craig J. Donnewald  
Finkel Martwick & Colson, PC  
203 North LaSalle Street  
Suite 1350  
Chicago, IL 60601-1293

COUNTY

Lake County Board of Review  
Lake County Courthouse  
18 North County Street, 7th Floor  
Waukegan, IL 60085