



## FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Trev Homsey  
DOCKET NO.: 24-01557.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 10-36-401-013

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Trev Homsey, 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:

<b>LAND:</b>	\$60,561
<b>IMPR.:</b>	\$139,110
<b>TOTAL:</b>	\$199,671

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 wood siding exterior construction with 1,948 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1988 with a reported effective age of 2000 and is approximately 36 years old in actual age. Features of the home include a basement with finished area, central air conditioning, a fireplace, and a 650 square foot garage.<sup>1</sup> The property has an approximately 7,070 square foot site and is located in Mundelein, Fremont Township, Lake County.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted information on five comparable sales located from 1.14 to 1.96-miles from

---

<sup>1</sup> The parties disagreed on some characteristics of the subject dwelling. The Board finds the best evidence of the subject's features is found in its property record card supplied by the board of review which was not refuted by the appellant.

the subject. None of the comparables have the same assigned assessment neighborhood code as the subject. The parcels range in size from 7,449 to 13,020 square feet of land area which are each improved with two-story dwellings of wood siding exterior construction. The dwellings range in age from 25 to 51 years old and range in size from 2,166 to 2,219 square feet of living area. Each comparable has an unfinished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace, and a garage ranging in size from 420 to 618 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from January 2023 to July 2024 for prices ranging from \$316,000 to \$395,000 or from \$145.49 to \$178.41 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduced total assessment of \$145,436 which would reflect a market value of approximately \$436,352 or \$224.00 per square foot of living area, including land, at the statutory level of assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$199,671. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$599,073 or \$307.53 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.<sup>2</sup>

As part of a memorandum, the board of review asserted the subject property was nearly destroyed by a fire and a permit was issued in June 2022 for \$850,000 concerning the improvement only. The board of review characterizes this permit was for the purpose of rebuilding the home "from the foundation up." The five sales presented by the appellant are non-lakefront properties from areas surrounding the subject.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales located either on the lake or have direct lake access. The comparables are located in the same neighborhood code as the subject and within .40 of a mile from the subject. The parcels range in size from 6,116 to 13,704 square feet of land area and are each improved with either a 1.5-story or a 2-story dwelling of Dryvit, combination,<sup>3</sup> wood or vinyl siding exterior construction. The homes are range in age from 28 to 66 years old and range in size from 2,216 to 2,991 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a full basement, with finished area ranging from 450 to 806 square feet. Features include central air conditioning, two fireplaces, and a garage ranging in size from 380 to 837 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from June 2022 to September 2024 for prices ranging from \$525,000 to \$1,130,000 or from \$236.91 to \$448.23 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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> The board of review described comparable #4 as having "CO" exterior construction, but did not provide a definition of the material type.

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 nine suggested comparable sales to support their respective positions before the Property Tax Appeal Board. The Board has given reduced weight to appellant's comparables, due to their distances from the subject property being from 1.14 to 1.96-miles from the subject. The Board has given reduced weight to board of review comparable #3, due to its much older age of 66 when compared to the 36-year-old subject.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value is found in board of review comparables #1, #2 and #4, which present varying degrees of similarity to the subject. The subject dwelling is smaller than all three of these best suggested comparables, indicating adjustments to the comparables would be appropriate to make them more equivalent to the subject. Likewise, there are differences in basement size, and/or basement finish when compared to the subject which also necessitate adjustments. On the other hand, the subject has a larger garage feature when compared to these best comparable properties suggesting upward adjustments to the comparables for this difference. The best comparables sold from May 2023 to September 2024 for prices ranging from \$525,000 to \$1,130,000 or from \$236.91 to \$448.23 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$599,073 or \$307.53 per square foot of living area, including land, which is within the range of the best comparable sales in this record both in terms of overall value and on a per-square-foot of living area basis, including land.

Based on this evidence and after considering appropriate adjustments to the 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: \_\_\_\_\_

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**

Trev Homsey, 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