



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

APPELLANT: Jack & Jill Pinto
DOCKET NO.: 23-00110.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 13-16-408-005

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Jack & Jill Pinto, the appellants, by attorney Scott Shudnow, of Shudnow & Shudnow, Ltd. 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 **A Reduction** 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: \$34,503
IMPR.: \$222,138
TOTAL: \$256,641

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellants 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 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 consists of a 2-story dwelling of brick and frame exterior construction with 4,981 square feet of living area.¹ The dwelling was built in 2000 and is approximately 23 years old. Features of the home include a walk-out basement with finished area, central air conditioning, three fireplaces, and a 3-car garage with approximately 1,050 square feet of building area. The property has approximately 41,243 square feet site and is located in Lake Barrington, Cuba Township, Lake County.

The appellants, through counsel, contend overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellants submitted an appraisal of the subject property with an estimated market value of \$770,000 as of January 1, 2023. The appraisal was prepared by Robert Merel, a

¹ The parties slightly differ as to the subject's dwelling size. The Board finds the best evidence of size was the board of review, through the township assessor, which accurately calculated the square footage of the appraisal to 4,981 square feet of living area, which was not refuted by the appellants.

Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser. The property rights appraised were fee simple and the purpose of the appraisal was for tax appeal. The appraiser described the subject as being in average condition and well maintained with interior finished being slightly dated.

In estimating the market value, the appraiser developed the sales comparison approach to value. The appraiser utilized three comparable sales located within .39 of a mile from the subject property. The comparables have sites ranging in size from 41,543 to 82,328 square feet of land area and are improved with traditional 2-story dwellings ranging in size from 4,080 to 4,685 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 15 to 31 years old. Each comparable has a basement with finished area. The comparables each have central air conditioning, from two to four fireplaces and either a 3-car or a 4-car garage. The comparables sold in January and April 2022 for prices ranging from \$710,000 to \$838,500 or from \$151.55 to \$205.51 per square foot of living area, including land. The appraiser applied adjustments to the comparables for differences when compared to the subject in site size, room count, gross living area, updates, and other features to arrive at adjusted prices ranging from \$710,000 to \$826,500. Based on the adjusted sale prices, the appraiser estimated the subject had a market value of \$770,000.

Based on this evidence, the appellants requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to reflect the appraised value.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$304,135. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$915,242 or \$183.75 per square foot of living area, land included, when using 4,981 square feet and when using the 2023 three-year average median level of assessment for Lake County of 33.23% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue.

In response to the appeal, the township assessor, through the board of review, does not feel that this property warrants any further reduction in value based on similar sale. Appraisal comparable #1 is 296 square feet smaller than the assessor above ground living area and no adjustments is given. This home is one of only two that were built in this subdivision and warrants a location adjustment. Appraisal comparable #2 has \$50,000 adjustment for newer baths, when the subject is described as having "updated kitchen and baths". Multiple Listing Service review does not warrant this adjustment. Appraisal #3 has an excessive, \$50,000 adjustment for site.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment of the subject property, the board of review submitted a grid analysis on five comparable sales. Comparable #4 is the same property as the appraisal's comparable #3. The properties are located from .21 of a mile to 2.4 miles from the subject property. These comparables have sites ranging in size from 44,849 to 85,378 square feet of land area and are improved with 2-story dwellings of frame or brick and frame exterior construction ranging in size from 4,120 to 5,344 square feet of living area. The comparables were constructed from 1994 to 2000. Each comparable is reported to have either a look-out or walk-out basement, four with finished area. The comparables each have central air conditioning, one or three fireplaces, and a garage ranging in size from 678 to 1,008 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from January 2022 to April 2023 for prices ranging from \$838,500 to \$1,125,000 or from \$165.27 to \$265.64 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this evidence, the board of review offered to reduce the subject's assessment total assessment to \$293,355.

In rebuttal, counsel for the appellants, rejected the reduced proposal and argued that the board of review comparables are unadjusted raw sales. Counsel for the appellants submitted Multiple Listing Service (MLS) data sheets for each of the board of review comparables which show that all of the board of review comparables have received substantial recent upgrades and/or rehabilitation and that the subject property is of “average condition” whereas the board of review comparables are superior to the subject.

Conclusion of Law

The appellants contend 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 appellants met this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is justified.

The Board finds the appellants submitted an appraisal and the board of review provided four comparable sales, one of which was utilized by the appellants' appraiser, to support their respective positions.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the appraisal submitted by the appellants. The appraiser developed the sales comparison approach to value using three recent comparable sales with varying degrees of similarity to the subject property. The appraiser adjusted the comparables for differences from the subject property, which appeared reasonable, and arrived at an estimated market value of \$770,000. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$915,242, which is greater than the appraised value. The Board gave less weight to comparables #1, #2 #3 and #5 submitted by the board of review which are located over one mile away from the subject.

Based on this record, the Board finds a reduction in the subject's assessment commensurate to the appellants' request 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: _____

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 15, 2025



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

Jack & Jill Pinto, by attorney:
Scott Shudnow
Shudnow & Shudnow, Ltd.
77 West Washington Street
Suite 1620
Chicago, IL 60602

COUNTY

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