



FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Terry Eiden
DOCKET NO.: 24-01434.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 06-26-113-027

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Terry Eiden, 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:	\$27,093
IMPR.:	\$70,366
TOTAL:	\$97,459

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 1-story dwelling of frame exterior construction with 1,480 square feet of living area. The dwelling was built in 1965 and is approximately 59 years old. Features of the home include a basement with finished area, central air conditioning and a garage with 550 square feet of building area.¹ The property has an approximately 15,677 square foot site and is located in Grayslake, Avon 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 in the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject and from .28 of a mile to 1.16 miles from the subject property. The comparables have sites that range in size from 7,501 to 13,007 square feet of land area. The comparables are improved with 1-story dwellings of frame exterior construction ranging in size

¹ The Board finds the best description of the subject is found in the property characteristic sheet provided by the board of review, that was not refuted by the appellant.

from 1,610 to 1,660 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 63 to 77 years old. Each comparable has central air conditioning and a garage ranging in size from 260 to 768 square feet of building area. Two comparables each have one fireplace. The comparables sold from January to August 2023 for prices ranging from \$234,000 to \$295,500 or from \$140.96 to \$178.55 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 \$97,459. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$292,406 or \$197.57 per square foot of living area, land included, when applying the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.²

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted information on three comparable sales. The comparables are located in the same assessment neighborhood as the subject and from .54 of a mile to 1.13 miles from the subject property. The comparables have sites ranging in size from 6,965 to 12,920 square feet of land area. The comparables are improved with 1-story dwellings of frame or brick exterior construction ranging in size from 1,177 to 1,503 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 70 to 73 years old. Each comparable has one fireplace. One comparable has a basement, two comparables each have central air conditioning and one comparable has a garage. The comparables sold from February to November 2024 for prices ranging from \$280,000 to \$310,000 or from \$199.60 to \$263.38 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 parties submitted a total of six comparable sales for the Board's consideration. The Board has given less weight to appellant's comparables #2 and #3 as well as board of review comparable #2 due to their distance of over one mile away from the subject.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be appellant's comparable #1 along with board of review comparables #1 and #3. The Board finds that these comparables are most similar to the subject in location, design and some features. However, each comparable is older in age and each have smaller lot sizes. Furthermore, two comparables lack a basement foundation and a garage, suggesting upwards adjustments would be required to make these comparables more

² 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). As of the development of this Final Administrative decision, the Department of Revenue has not published figures for tax year 2024.

equivalent to the subject. Nevertheless, these most similar comparables sold from January 2023 to October 2024 for prices ranging from \$234,000 to \$300,000 or from \$140.96 to \$212.77 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$292,406 or \$197.57 per square foot of living area, including land, is falls within the range of the best comparable sales in this record.

The constitutional provision for uniformity of taxation and valuation does not require mathematical equality. The requirement is satisfied if the intent is evident to adjust the taxation burden with a reasonable degree of uniformity and if such is the effect of the statue enacted by the General Assembly establishing the method of assessing real property in its general operation. A practical uniformity, rather than an absolute one, is the test. Apex Motor Fuel Co. v. Barrett, 20 Ill.2d 395 (1960). Although the comparables presented by the parties disclosed that properties located in the same area are not assessed at identical levels, all that the constitution requires is a practical uniformity, which appears to exist on the basis of the evidence presented.

Based on this record and after considering adjustments to the best comparables for differences when compared to the subject, the Board finds 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: _____

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

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

Terry Eiden, 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