



FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT: Daniel Ritaca
DOCKET NO.: 24-01776.001-R-2
PARCEL NO.: 16-05-301-090

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Daniel Ritaca, the appellant, by attorney Timothy C. Jacobs, of Kovitz Shifrin Nesbit in Chicago; 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:	\$235,967
IMPR.:	\$799,460
TOTAL:	\$1,035,427

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 two improvements with a combined 7,737 square feet of living area.¹ Improvement #1 a 2-story dwelling with 6,808 square feet of living area that was constructed in 2015 and is approximately 9 years old. Improvement #1 features a basement with finished area, central air conditioning, an attached 921 square foot garage with a 377 square foot carport, an inground swimming pool, and a pool house. Improvement #2 is a 1.75-story coach house with 929 square feet of living area and a garage that was built in 1925. Improvement #2 features a concrete slab foundation, central air conditioning, and a 651 square foot garage. The property has a 79,079 square foot site and is located in Lake Forest, West Deerfield Township, Lake County.

¹ The parties differ regarding the sizes of the subject's improvements. The Board finds the best evidence of these improvements is found in the subject's property record card as the appellant's appraisal omits "21 unlisted calculations" that the appraiser used to compute the subject's living area.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted an appraisal estimating the subject property had a market value of \$2,240,000 as of January 1, 2023. The appraisal was prepared by Amber Meyer, a certified residential real estate appraiser, for ad valorem tax purposes.

The appraiser noted the subject has some items of deferred maintenance, including interior painting, water damage to an exterior patio, and damage to retaining walls, for which the homeowner provided an estimate of \$86,315.88 to repair. The appraiser stated the subject's overall condition is good.²

Under the sales comparison approach, the appraiser selected four comparable sales located from 0.41 of a mile to 1.73 miles from the subject. The parcels range in size from 39,568 to 89,298 square feet of land area and are improved with Traditional or French Provincial style homes ranging in size from 5,391 to 7,152 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 14 to 24 years old with comparable #1 reported to have been remodeled in 2019. Each home features a basement with finished area, central air conditioning, and a 3-car or a 4-car garage. Comparables #1 and #2 have an inground swimming pool and comparable #3 has a tennis court. The comparables sold in August and December 2022 for prices ranging from \$1,950,000 to \$2,450,000 or from \$342.56 to \$413.19 per square foot of living area, including land.

The appraiser adjusted the comparables for differences from the subject, such as site size, condition, dwelling size, basement finished area, garage size,³ and other features and improvements. The appraiser further adjusted each comparable \$125,000 for repairs needed, noting this adjustment is the cost of repairs plus an amount reflective of market resistance for the inconvenience of having to make repairs. The appraiser then reported adjusted prices from \$2,203,000 to \$2,276,000 and concluded a value for the subject of \$2,240,000 as of January 1, 2023.

Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to reflect the appraised value conclusion.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$1,035,427. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$3,106,592 or \$401.52 per square foot of combined living area, land included, when using the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.⁴ In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales located from next door to 2.65 miles from the subject, together with a map depicting the locations of these comparables in relation to the subject. The parcels range in size from 20,446 to 89,734 square feet of land area

² In contrast, the subject's property record card reports the subject home is in average condition and the coach house is in very good condition.

³ The properties with a 4-car garage each received a \$40,000 adjustment but the property with a 3-car garage received no adjustment for garage size, despite the subject having two garages.

⁴ Section 1910.50(c)(1) of the Board's procedural rules 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 § 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.

and are improved with 1.5-story, 1.75-story, or 2-story homes ranging in size from 5,017 to 7,704 square feet of living area. The dwellings range in age from 6 to 95 years old. Each home has a basement, three of which have finished area, central air conditioning, and a garage ranging in size from 678 to 992 square feet of building area. Comparables #1 and #4 each have an inground swimming pool with comparable #1 also having a bath house. The comparables sold from September 2023 to August 2024 for prices ranging from \$3,025,000 to \$4,450,000 or from \$510.63 to \$886.98 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 appellant presented an appraisal and the board of review presented four comparable sales in support of their respective positions before the Board. The Board gives less weight to the appraised value conclusion, which states a value conclusion more than a year prior to the assessment date and relies on sales occurring in 2022, less proximate in time to the assessment date than the sales presented by the board of review. Furthermore, the Board finds the appraiser's adjustments to be questionable and unsupported. The appraiser did not state how the \$125,000 adjustment for repairs was derived from the \$86,315.88 estimate obtained by the owner. The appraiser also did not adjust comparable #1 for garage size despite the subject's two garages unlike this comparable. For these reasons, the Board finds the appraisal states a less credible and/or reliable opinion of value.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the board of review's comparables, which sold more proximate in time to the assessment date and are relatively similar to the subject in dwelling size and location but have varying degrees of similarity to the subject in age, site size, basement finish, fireplace count, garage count and size, and other improvements, suggesting adjustments to these comparables would be needed to make them more equivalent to the subject. These comparables sold for prices ranging from \$3,025,000 to \$4,450,000 or from \$510.63 to \$886.98 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$3,106,592 or \$401.52 per square foot of living area, including land, which is within the range established by the best comparable sales in terms of total market value and below the range on a per square foot basis. The subject's assessment reflects a market value that is below the board of review's comparable #1, which is located next door to the subject and is the most similar to the subject in dwelling size, age, site size, and many features, such as an inground swimming pool and a bath house. The subject's assessment below these comparables would appear to reflect its average condition as reported in the subject's property record card. Based on this evidence and after considering appropriate adjustments to the best comparables for differences from 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

Daniel Ritaca, by attorney:
Timothy C. Jacobs
Kovitz Shifrin Nesbit
640 N. La Salle Drive
Suite 495
Chicago, IL 60654

COUNTY

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