



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

APPELLANT: Teri Krcmarik
DOCKET NO.: 24-01286.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 01-25-200-038

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Teri Krcmarik, the appellant, by attorney Ronald Kingsley, of Lake County Real Estate Tax Appeal, LLC in Hawthorn Woods; 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: \$6,887
IMPR.: \$125,964
TOTAL: \$132,851

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 an approximately 19,724 square foot site improved with a 2-story dwelling of wood siding exterior construction containing 2,482 square feet of living area and is approximately 19 years old. Features of the home include 2½ bathrooms, an unfinished basement, central air conditioning, 1 fireplace, and a garage containing 460 square feet of building area. The property is located in Antioch, Antioch Township, Lake County.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted a grid analysis with information on three comparable sales located from .59 of a mile to 1.09 miles from the subject property. The comparables have sites ranging in size from approximately 7,932 to 41,190 square feet of land area that are improved with 2-story dwellings of wood frame construction. The comparables range in size from 2,640 to 2,775 square feet of living area and range in age from 18 to 47 years old. Each comparable has 2½ or

3½ bathrooms, an unfinished basement, central air conditioning, and a garage ranging in size from 441 to 759 square feet of building area. Two comparables each have 1 fireplace. The comparables sold in March or April 2023 for prices ranging from \$280,000 to \$489,000 or from \$106.06 to \$176.22 per square foot of living area, including land. Appellant's counsel also submitted a brief describing the similarities of the comparable properties to the subject. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested the subject's total assessment be reduced to \$107,543 to reflect a market value of \$322,661 or \$130.00 per square foot of living area, land included.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$132,851. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$398,593 or \$160.59 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.¹

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted a grid analysis with information on three comparable sales located from .16 of a mile to 3.36 miles from the subject, and only one of which is located within the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject property. The comparables have parcels ranging from approximately 16,501 to 21,679 square feet of land area. The sites are improved with 2-story dwellings of wood siding exteriors that range in size from 1,606 to 2,128 square feet of living area and are either 30 or 35 years old. Each dwelling features 2½ bathrooms, a basement (one of which is partially finished), central air conditioning, and a garage containing either 440 or 725 square feet of building area. Comparable #1 also features 1 fireplace. The comparables sold from October 2023 to April 2024 for prices ranging from \$310,000 to \$385,000 or from \$180.92 to \$193.03 per square foot of living area, including land.

The board of review also submitted a memorandum contending that appellant's comparable #1 was a short sale and thus should not be considered, and comparables #2 and #3 are each located in more desirable locations.

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 parties submitted a total of six comparable sales for the Board's consideration. After analyzing the evidence submitted, the Board gave less weight to appellant's comparable #1 which appears to be an outlier given its lower market value when compared to the remaining comparables in the record. Additionally, appellant's comparable #1 has a significantly larger lot

¹ Procedural rule Sec. 1910.50(c)(1) 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 Sec. 1910.50(c)(1). Prior to the drafting of this decision, the Department of Revenue has yet to publish figures for tax year 2024.

size relative to the subject parcel. The Board also gave less weight to the board of review comparables based on their significantly smaller dwelling sizes relative to the subject dwelling. Additionally, board of review comparable #2 has a finished basement, unlike the subject dwelling, and comparables #2 and #3 are located greater than 3 miles in distance from the subject property.

On this record, the Board finds the best evidence of market value to be appellant's comparables #2 and #3 which are located approximately 1 mile or less from the subject and are most similar overall to the subject in dwelling size, age, unfinished basements, and other features. However, each of these comparables has a smaller lot size than the subject and comparable #2 is slightly older in age, suggesting that upward adjustments would be appropriate to these comparables for these difference in order to make them more equivalent to the subject property. Conversely, comparable #3 has one more bathroom than the subject, suggesting that slight downward adjustment would be necessary to this comparable.

The two best comparables in this record sold in March 2023 for prices of \$387,500 and \$489,000 or for \$143.95 and \$176.22 per square foot of living area, including land, respectively. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$398,593 or \$160.59 per square foot of living area, including land, which bracketed by the two best comparable sales in this record both in terms of overall value and on a per square foot of living area basis.

Based on this record and after considering adjustments to the best comparables in this record for differences from the subject, the Board finds that the appellant did not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the subject property is overvalued and, thus, 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: _____

January 20, 2026



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

Teri Krcmarik, by attorney:
Ronald Kingsley
Lake County Real Estate Tax Appeal, LLC
40 Landover Parkway
Suite 3
Hawthorn Woods, IL 60047

COUNTY

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