



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

APPELLANT: Dawn & Rolando Pulido
DOCKET NO.: 23-02977.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 07-18-110-018

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Dawn & Rolando Pulido, the appellants; 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: \$25,841
IMPR.: \$130,810
TOTAL: \$156,651

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 parties appeared before the Property Tax Appeal Board on March 25, 2025 for a hearing at the Lake County Board of Review Offices in Waukegan pursuant to prior written notice dated February 13, 2025. Appearing was appellant Dawn Paulido and on behalf of the Lake County Board of Review was Jack Perry, Mass Appraisal Specialist.

The subject property consists of a 2-story dwelling of wood siding exterior construction with 3,824 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 2002 and is approximately 21 years old. Features of the home include a basement with finished area,¹ central air conditioning, one fireplace and a 641 square foot garage. The property has an approximately 17,906 square foot site and is located in Gurnee, Warren Township, Lake County.

¹ At hearing the Ms. Paulido confirmed the subject property has finished basement area as disclosed in the board of review's evidence.

The appellants contend overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellants submitted information on three comparable sales located within 554 feet of the subject property. The comparables have sites that range in size from 9,880 to 13,560 square feet of land area and are improved with 2-story dwellings of wood siding exterior construction ranging in size from 3,804 to 3,842 square feet of living area that were built in 2001 or 2002. Each comparable has a basement with finished area,² central air conditioning, one fireplace and a 640 or 641 square foot garage. The properties sold from May to October 2021 for prices ranging from \$418,900 to \$435,000 or from \$109.32 to \$113.76 per square foot of living area, land included.

In both written and oral testimony, Ms. Paulido argued the purchase price for the subject property in September 2021 of \$470,000 exceeded market value. The appellants submitted photographs and commentary for their comparables #1 and #3 identifying superior elements of these two properties such as newer flooring, updated kitchen elements and granite countertops, contending the subject property lacks these features. In support of the subject's condition, the appellants submitted photographs and cost estimates documenting the subject's physical condition at the time the property was purchased. The appellants' photographs depict a vinyl countertop, wood flooring, carpeting, windows and driveway which show a need for repair or maintenance. Windows are depicted to suffer from condensation. The appellants submitted cost estimates to repair or replace the subject's HVAC system, windows, patio door, driveway/sidewalks, flooring and patio pavers that range from \$77,100 to \$83,100. The appellants argued another \$35,000 for cabinets, countertops, tile and millwork is required, for a total of more than \$100,000 in repair costs.

Based on this evidence, the appellants requested the subject's total assessment be reduced to \$146,652 which reflects a market value of \$440,000 or \$115.06 per square foot of living area, land included, when applying the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.

Under cross examination, Ms. Paulido testified the documented condition elements for the subject property were all present on the date of purchase and as of January 1, 2023.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$156,651. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$471,414 or \$123.28 per square foot of living area, land included, 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.

Initially, Mr. Perry asserted, a contemporaneous sale between two parties dealing at arm's-length is not only relevant to the question of fair cash value but is practically conclusive on the issue of whether an assessment is reflective of market value. Korzen v. Belt Railway Co. of Chicago, 37 Ill.2d 158 (1967).

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on three comparable sales located within 824 feet of the subject property. The comparables have

² Ms. Paulido testified that each of their comparable properties has a finished basement, which was not refuted by the board of review.

sites that range in size from 10,021 to 12,711 square feet of land area and are improved with 2-story dwellings of wood siding exterior construction ranging in size from 3,236 to 3,290 square feet of living area that are either 21 or 22 years old. Each comparable has a basement, with two having finished area. Each dwelling has central air conditioning, one fireplace and either a 441 or a 599 square foot garage. The properties sold from September 2022 to November 2023 for prices ranging from \$420,000 to \$473,000 or from \$127.66 to \$146.17 per square foot of living area, land included. The board of review also submitted a copy of the Multiple Listing Service (MLS) sheet associated with the September 2021 purchase of the subject property. The MLS disclosed a list price of \$439,900, a purchase price of \$470,000 and two days on market. The MLS also disclosed the subject was agent owned with a “Broker Owned/Interest.”

Mr. Perry critiqued the appellants’ comparables arguing the 2021 sales are less proximate to the assessment date at issue and therefore less reflective of market value as of the January 1, 2023. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested the subject’s assessment be confirmed.

Under questioning, Mr. Perry stated the reason for the subject’s assessment reduction at the local level was not known, however, Mr. Perry stated the home’s condition likely explains the reduction as the Lake County Board of Review rarely adopts a 2021 sale price for a 2023 assessment complaint. Ms. Paulido confirmed that local assessing officials indicated condition was a consideration in their decision to reduce the subject’s assessment.

Ms. Paulido testified the subject property had been appraised at the time of purchase and that the appraised value met the contract price. She also testified the home inspector utilized for the transaction was related to their real estate agent. Ms. Paulido testified the appellants purchased the subject property very quickly and felt pressured by their agent. As to condition issues present at the subject property, she testified that placement of rugs and blinds hid flooring and window condition.

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 did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

As an initial matter, the Board finds the appellants’ comparable sales support their contention the September 2021 purchase price of the subject property exceeded market value. Furthermore, Ms. Paulido’s testimony asserts their agent and home inspector were related and the appellants felt pressure to sign a contract quickly. The MLS sheet submitted by the board of review disclosed the subject property was agent owned with an agent ownership interest in the sale. As to applicable case law, the Board acknowledges that a contemporaneous sale between two parties dealing at arm's-length is not only relevant to the question of fair cash value but is practically conclusive on the issue of whether an assessment is reflective of market value. Korzen v. Belt Railway Co. of Chicago, 37 Ill.2d 158 (1967).

Additionally, the Illinois Supreme Court has defined fair cash value as what the property would bring at a voluntary sale where the owner is ready, willing, and able to sell but not compelled to do so, and the buyer is ready, willing and able to buy but not forced to do so. Springfield Marine Bank v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 44 Ill.2d. 428, (1970). Based on this definition of fair cash value and the record evidence, the Board acknowledges the issues raised by the appellants questioning the arm's length nature of the transaction. In this regard, the fact that the seller, an agent with an interest in the property, recommended a relative for purposes of a home inspection while the buyers, as Ms. Paulido testified, felt pressured to sign the contract in an expedited timeframe legitimately raises doubts about the transaction.

Nevertheless, the question before this Board is the determination of the correct assessment of the subject property as of January 1, 2023 based on the market value evidence. The parties submitted six comparable sales for the Board's consideration. The Board gives less weight to the appellants' comparables #1 and #2 which sold 16 and 19 months prior to the assessment date at issue. The Board gives less weight to board of review comparable #2 which has an unfinished basement in contrast to the subject's finished basement.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be appellants' comparable #3 along with board of review comparables #1 and #3 which are most similar to the subject in location, age, design and basement amenities. However, each of these best properties has a smaller site size while two of these properties have a smaller dwelling size and smaller garage size and one comparable has some superior updates when compared to the subject, suggesting adjustments are needed to make these properties more equivalent to the subject. These best comparables sold from October 2021 to August 2023 for prices ranging from \$420,000 to \$473,000 or from \$113.76 to \$146.17 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$471,414 or \$123.28 per square foot of living area, including land, which falls within the range established by the best comparable sales in this record. After considering appropriate adjustments to the best comparables for differences from the subject, the Board finds the subject's assessment is justified and a reduction in the subject's assessment 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. 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

Dawn & Rolando Pulido
1472 Greystone Drive
Gurnee, IL 60031

COUNTY

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