



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

APPELLANT: Elizabeth Gratereaux  
DOCKET NO.: 24-04995.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 16-07-105-002

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Elizabeth Gratereaux, 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:** \$110,344  
**IMPR.:** \$120,357  
**TOTAL:** \$230,701

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 one-story dwelling of wood siding exterior construction with 2,511 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1953 and is approximately 71 years old. Features of the home include a full basement with finished area, central air conditioning, two fireplace, 3 bathrooms and an 894 square foot detached garage. The property has a 38,610 square foot site and is located in Lake Forest, West Deerfield Township, Lake County.

The appellant's appeal is based on overvaluation. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted a grid analysis with information on four comparable sales, as comparable #5 did not contain a sales price.<sup>1</sup> The comparables are located within the subject's assessment

---

<sup>1</sup> The Board will not give any consideration to appellant's comparable #5 in this market value analysis as there is no evidence that this property recently sold.

neighborhood code and within .67 of a mile from the subject. The comparables have parcels ranging in size from 28,600 to 132,860 and are improved with one-story dwellings of brick or wood exterior construction, ranging in size from 2,338 to 3,367 square feet of living area. The comparables were constructed from 1949 to 1964 and are approximately 60 to 75 years old. Each comparable has air conditioning, two or four fireplaces, 2, 2½ or 3 bathrooms, and a garage ranging in size from 460 to 754 square feet of building area. Three comparables have a partial basement, one with finished area, and two comparables have a slab or crawl space foundation. The comparables sold from January 2022 to January 2025 for prices ranging from \$702,500 to \$806,738 or from \$225.72 to \$345.05 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested the subject's total assessment be reduced.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$230,701. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$692,172 or \$275.66 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.<sup>2</sup>

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted a grid analysis with information on three comparable sales, with comparable #1 being the same property as appellant's comparable #3, located within the subject's assessment neighborhood code and within .64 of a mile from the subject. The comparables have parcels ranging in size from 54,886 to 132,858 and are improved with one-story dwellings of brick exterior construction, ranging in size from 2,007 to 3,008 square feet of living area. The comparables are approximately 58 to 73 years old. Each comparable has central air conditioning, one or two fireplaces, 2½ or 3 bathrooms, a garage ranging in size from 406 to 802 square feet of building area and two comparables have a partial unfinished basement. The comparables sold from September 2023 to November 2024 for prices ranging from \$687,500 to \$1,400,000 or from \$342.55 to \$465.43 per square foot of living area, including land.

In rebuttal, appellant's counsel argued that the board of review's three comparables are not truly comparable to the subject property because they have brick exteriors, unlike subject, and two of the comparables were recently rebuilt or rehabilitated, making them significantly younger in effective age than indicated on the board of review's grid. Counsel also provided land value figures for comparables #1 and #2; however, these amounts are unsubstantiated, and it is unclear how they were derived.

### **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

---

<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 drafting of this decision, the Department of Revenue has yet to publish figures for tax year 2024.

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.

As a preliminary matter, the Board finds counsel's argument, that the board of review's comparables are not true comparables due to differences in exterior construction and allegedly younger effective ages, to be unpersuasive and unsupported by the record. The Board further finds that counsel failed to provide any corroborating evidence to substantiate the claimed effective ages of the board of review's comparable properties.

The parties submitted a total of six comparable sales for the Board's consideration, including one sale common to both parties. After reviewing the evidence, the Board assigned reduced weight to the appellant's comparables #1, #2, and #4 because they sold in 2022, more remote from the January 1, 2024 valuation date at issue than the remaining comparables in the record. As a result, these sales are less likely to reflect the subject property's market value as of the assessment date compared to other, more recent sales in the record. Lastly, the Board assigns less weight to the board of review's comparable #3 due to its foundation type which differs from subject's basement amenity.

On this record, the Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the appellant's comparable #3/ board of review #1, the common comparable between the parties, and the board of review's comparable #2, which are located in the subject's assessment neighborhood code and are overall most similar to the subject in age, dwelling size, design, basement amenity and other features. Although these two comparables have larger parcel sizes and/or dwelling size than the subject, warranting downward adjustments, they also have smaller basement and garage areas, which support upward adjustments. The two best comparables in the record sold in September 2023 and April 2024, closest in time to January 1, 2024, lien date, for prices of \$806,738 and \$1,400,000 or for \$345.05 and \$465.43 per square foot of living area, including land. By comparison, the subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$692,172 or \$275.66 per square foot of living area, including land, which is below the two best comparables in overall market value and price per square foot.

Based on this record and after considering all the comparables submitted by the parties with emphasis on those properties that sold most proximate in time to the lien date at issue and those most similar in characteristics to the subject, and after considering adjustments to the best comparables in this record for differences from the subject such as parcel the Board finds that the appellant did not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the subject property is overvalued. Therefore, based on the evidence, 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:

April 21, 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

Elizabeth Gratereaux, 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