



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

APPELLANT: Denise Shane  
DOCKET NO.: 24-01243.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 16-07-406-013

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Denise Shane, the appellant, by attorney Andrew J. Rukavina, of The Tax Appeal Company in Mundelein; 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:** \$200,171  
**IMPR.:** \$205,522  
**TOTAL:** \$405,693

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 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 2-story dwelling of brick exterior construction with 4,798 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1989, is approximately 35 years old, and has an effective age of 2003 due to remodeling in 2017.<sup>1</sup> Features of the home include a basement with 1,701 square feet of finished area, central air conditioning, three fireplaces, four full bathrooms, one half bathroom, and a 1,025 square foot garage. The property has an approximately 67,080 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 information on three comparable sales located within 0.18 of a mile from the

---

<sup>1</sup> Additional details regarding the subject not reported by the appellant are found in its property record card presented by the board of review, and were not refuted by the appellant.

subject. The parcels range in size from 57,930 to 67,080 square feet of land area and are improved with 2-story homes ranging in size from 5,301 to 6,888 square feet of living area. The homes were built in 1988 or 1990. Each home has a basement with 2,296 to 3,000 square feet of finished area, central air conditioning, two fireplaces, five or eight full bathrooms, and a garage ranging in size from 985 to 1,521 square feet of building area. One comparable also has a half bathroom. The comparables sold in April 2022 and July 2023 for prices ranging from \$1,240,000 to \$1,640,000 or from \$202.53 to \$242.17 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$405,693. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$1,217,201 or \$253.69 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.<sup>2</sup>

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on two comparable sales located within 0.46 of a mile from the subject. The comparables have 60,984 and 61,855 square foot sites that are improved with 2-story homes with 5,577 and 5,846 square feet of living area. The dwellings are 29 or 37 years old. Each home has a basement with 1,428 or 2,203 square feet of finished area, central air conditioning, four fireplaces, five or six full bathrooms, one or two half bathrooms, and an 840 or a 1,118 square foot garage. The comparables sold in May and June 2023 for prices of \$1,390,000 and \$2,250,000 or \$249.24 and \$384.88 per square foot of living area, including land, respectively. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

In written rebuttal, the appellant argued the board of review's comparable #1 is a newer home than the subject; had a new roof in 2020 and new mechanicals in 2021 features a deck, gazebo, and hot tub, which are not features of the subject; and has more bathrooms and larger finished basement area and garage than the subject. With respect to the board of review's comparable #2, the appellant contended this property was rehabbed in 2017; has more bathrooms and is a larger home than the subject; has basement features unlike the subject, such as a sunken theater, golf simulator, upscale bar and cabinets; has more fireplaces than the subject; and has a swimming pool, pergola room, and outdoor kitchen unlike the subject.

### **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.

---

<sup>2</sup> Section 1910.50(c)(1) of the Board's procedural rules provides that in all counties other than Cook, the three-year county wide assessment level as certified by the Department of Revenue will be considered. 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.50(c)(1). As of the development of this Final Administrative decision, the Department of Revenue has not published figures for tax year 2024.

The record contains a total of five comparable sales for the Board's consideration. The Board gives less weight to the appellant's comparables #2 and #3, due to substantial differences from the subject in dwelling size, and to the board of review's comparable #2, which has an inground swimming pool and other outdoor features unlike the subject.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the appellant's comparable #1 and the board of review's comparable #1, which sold proximate in time to the assessment date and are more similar to the subject in dwelling size, age, site size, location, and most features, although these comparables differ from the subject in size of basement finished area, bathroom count, fireplace count, garage size, and other features, suggesting adjustments to these comparables would be needed to make them more equivalent to the subject. These most similar comparables sold for prices of \$1,240,000 and \$1,390,000 or \$233.92 and \$249.24 per square foot of living area, including land, respectively. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$1,217,201 or \$253.69 per square foot of living area, including land, which is below the two best comparable sales in terms of total market value and above the two best comparables on a per square foot basis, which is logical given the subject is a smaller home than these two comparables. Based on this evidence and after considering appropriate adjustments to the best comparables for differences from the subject, 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: \_\_\_\_\_

December 23, 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

Denise Shane, by attorney:  
Andrew J. Rukavina  
The Tax Appeal Company  
28643 North Sky Crest Drive  
Mundelein, IL 60060

COUNTY

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