



FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Marco Bermudez
DOCKET NO.: 24-01436.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 06-28-120-015

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Marco Bermudez, 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:	\$8,022
IMPR.:	\$87,984
TOTAL:	\$96,006

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 1,174 square feet of living area. The dwelling was built in 2007 and is approximately 17 years old. Features of the home include a basement/lower level with finished area, central air conditioning and a garage with 400 square feet of building area.¹ The property has an approximately 4,199 square foot site and is located in Round Lake Park, 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 within .71 of a mile from the subject property. The comparables have sites that range in size from 4,186 to 8,141 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 1,056 to 1,112 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 18 to 48 years old. Each comparable has central air conditioning and a garage ranging in size from 420 to 598 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from October 2023 to July 2024 for prices ranging from \$238,000 to \$275,000 or from \$225.38 to \$250.46 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 \$96,006. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$288,047 or \$245.36 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. Comparables #2 and #3 are the same properties as the appellant's comparables #3 and #1, respectively. The comparables are located in the same assessment neighborhood as the subject and within .71 of a mile from the subject property. The comparables have sites ranging in size from 4,800 to 8,141 square feet of land area. The comparables are improved with 1-story dwellings of frame exterior construction ranging in size from 1,014 to 1,112 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 17 to 47 years old. Each comparable has a basement/lower level with finished area, central air conditioning and a garage with 420 or 598 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from June 2023 to June 2024 for prices ranging from \$270,000 to \$285,000 or from \$247.30 to \$281.07 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 four comparable sales for the Board's consideration, with two comparables being common to both parties. The Board has given less weight to appellant's comparable #2 as well as appellant's comparable #1/board of review comparable #3 due to their older ages when compared to the subject.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be appellant's comparable #3/board of review comparable #2 along with board of review comparable #1. The Board finds that these two comparables are most similar to the subject in location, age, design, and some features. These

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.

two most similar comparables sold in June 2023 and June 2024 for prices of \$270,000 and \$285,000 or \$250.46 and \$281.07 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$288,047 or \$245.36 per square foot of living area, including land, is falls below the two best comparable sales in this record on a per square foot basis but is slightly above on an overall market value, which is logical given the subject's somewhat larger dwelling size relative to the two best comparables.

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

Marco Bermudez, 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