



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

APPELLANT: TKALCEVIC BLACK
DOCKET NO.: 24-01550.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 16-17-205-009

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are TKALCEVIC BLACK, 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: \$192,685
IMPR.: \$184,441
TOTAL: \$377,126

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 two-story dwelling of brick exterior construction with 4,137 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1976 and is approximately 48 years old. Features of the home include a basement with 546 square feet of finished area, 3½ bathrooms, central air conditioning, a fireplace, a 792 square foot garage, and a tennis court.¹ The property has an approximately 59,242 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 .30 of a mile from the subject. The comparables each have the same assigned assessment neighborhood code as the

¹ The appellant did not report the tennis court amenity, but also did not refute the assertion made by the board of review supported by the subject's property record card.

subject. The parcels range in size from 5,968 to 60,980 square feet of land area which are each improved with either a 1-story, a 1.75-story or a 2-story dwelling of brick or wood siding exterior construction. The dwellings are either 48 or 51 years old and range in size from 3,279 to 5,329 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a basement with finished area ranging from 660 to 675 square feet, 2½, 3½ or 4½ bathrooms, central air conditioning, one or two fireplaces, and a garage ranging in size from 425 to 840 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from March 2022 to August 2023 for prices ranging from \$774,479 to \$1,250,000 or from \$167.95 to \$253.19 per square foot of living area, including land.

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduced total assessment of \$325,973 which would reflect a market value of approximately \$977,117 or \$236.19 per square foot of living area, including land.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$377,126. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$1,131,491 or \$273.51 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.²

In rebuttal to the appellant's evidence, the board of review argued that appellant's comparables #1 and #2 sold 29 months and 33 months prior to the lien date of January 1, 2024. The board of review also noted that the parties have a common property in appellant's comparable #3.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales located in the same neighborhood code within .57 of a mile from the subject and where board of review comparable #2 is the same property as appellant's comparable #3. The board of review included a location map with a narrative contending all four of the board of review comparables are in the subject's immediate market area and school district. The four parcels range in size from 58,806 to 64,033 square feet of land area and are each improved with either a 1.75-story or a 2-story dwelling of brick or wood siding exterior construction. The homes range in age from 46 to 55 years old and range in size from 3,520 to 4,937 square feet of living area. The board of review also noted that the parties' common property has a dwelling which is 19% larger than the subject dwelling. Each comparable has a basement, three of which have finished areas ranging in size from 675 to 985 square feet. Features include 3½ or 4½ bathrooms, central air conditioning, one or two fireplaces, and a garage ranging in size from 483 to 1,116 square feet of building area. Comparable #1 has a tennis court and comparable #3 has an inground swimming pool. The comparables sold from August 2022 to August 2023 for prices ranging from \$1,235,000 to \$1,260,000 or from \$253.19 to \$357.95 per square foot of living area, including land.

Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's estimated market value as reflected by its assessment.

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). Prior to the issuance of this decision, the Department of Revenue has yet to publish Table 3 with the figures for tax year 2024.

Appellant's counsel filed rebuttal on both October 21, 2025 and November 3, 2025. Both submissions were timely filed. Analyzing both filings, the criticisms are summarized herein. Board of review comparable #1 was reportedly rehabbed in 2020, has more fireplaces, differs in dwelling size and garage size when compared to the subject. The appellant also asserts this property has a "large outdoor pool," hot tub area, sauna and outdoor kitchen.³ Although board of review comparable #2 is a common property with the appellant, the appellant notes this dwelling differs in story height, dwelling size and fireplace count when compared to the subject. Board of review comparable #3 was criticized for distant location from the subject, having been rehabbed in 2012, larger finished basement size, larger garage, and a heated swimming pool which all differ from the subject property. Board of review comparable #4 was criticized by the appellant for having been recently renovated, a large enclosed porch, more bathrooms, a larger finished basement, and a larger first floor living area than 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.

The parties submitted a total of six suggested comparable sales, one of which was common to both parties, to support their respective positions before the Property Tax Appeal Board. The Board has given reduced weight to the appellant's comparable #2, due to its reported one-story design and more than 28% larger dwelling size when compared to the subject.

On this limited record, the Board finds the best evidence of market value consists of appellant's comparables #1 and #3 along with the board of review comparables, which includes the parties' common comparable. The properties are similar to the subject in location and have large parcels, relatively similar in size to the subject. These dwellings range in age from 46 to 55 years old, bracketing the subject's age of 48 years old. The dwellings range in size when compared to the subject necessitating adjustments for differences to make the comparables more equivalent to the subject. Likewise, adjustments are also necessary for differences in basement size, size of basement finish, bathroom count, fireplace count, and/or garage size when compared to the subject. Besides the subject, only one comparable has a tennis court, suggesting upward adjustments to the remaining best comparables for this difference, although a downward adjustment is also needed for properties with inground swimming pool amenities, which is not a feature of the subject. These five best comparables sold from July 2022 to August 2023 for prices ranging from \$774,479 to \$1,260,000 or from \$236.19 to \$357.95 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$1,131,491 or \$273.51 per square foot of living area, including land, which is within the range of the comparable sales in this record both in terms of overall value and on a per-square-foot of living area basis. Furthermore, given the best evidence in the record, greatest weight should be placed on board of

³ The appellant did not allege that the pool is an inground swimming pool. Above-grade swimming pools are not part of the real property and instead treated as personal property by assessment officials.

review comparable #4 which is most similar to the subject in lot size, story height, exterior construction, dwelling size, basement size and garage size with an upward adjustment needed for the age difference and lack of a tennis court along with a downward adjustment for superior bathroom count. As depicted in the record without these foregoing adjustments, board of review comparable #4 reflects a higher overall market value and per square foot of living area, including land, value when compared to the subject's estimated market value which further supports that a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted on market value grounds.

Based on this evidence and a thorough analysis, considering appropriate adjustments to the best five comparable sales in the record for differences from the subject to make the comparables more equivalent to 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: _____

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

TKALCEVIC BLACK, 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