



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

APPELLANT: Labib Khanafer
DOCKET NO.: 23-00397.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 13-15-203-016

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Labib Khanafer, the appellant, by attorney Gregory Riggs, of Tax Appeals Lake County in Lake Zurich; 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: \$39,711
IMPR.: \$243,291
TOTAL: \$283,002

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 2023 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 2-story dwelling of frame with brick exterior construction with 5,252 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 2001. Features of the home include a basement with finished area, central air conditioning, three fireplaces, a 714 square foot garage, and an inground swimming pool. The property has a 62,726 square foot site and is located in Lake Barrington, Cuba 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 within 0.32 of a mile from the subject. The parcels range in size from 53,143 to 85,378 square feet of land area and are improved with 2-story homes of brick, frame, or frame with brick exterior construction. The dwellings range in size from 4,925 to 5,231 square feet of living area and were built from 1999 to 2001. Each home has a basement, two of which have finished area and two of which are a

lookout or a walkout. Each comparable also features central air conditioning, one or three fireplaces, and a garage ranging in size from 714 to 924 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from February 2021 to April 2023 for prices ranging from \$700,000 to \$845,000 or from \$133.82 to \$165.27 per square foot of living area, including land. The appellant also disclosed the subject sold in July 2021 for a price of \$812,000. 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 \$283,002. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$849,091 or \$161.67 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.¹

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales² located within 0.97 of a mile from the subject. Comparable #1 is the same sale as the appellant's comparable #2. The parcels range in size from 42,253 to 85,378 square feet of land area and are improved with 2-story homes of frame or frame with brick exterior construction. The dwellings range in size from 4,113 to 5,113 square feet of living area and were built from 1998 to 2001. Each home has a basement, two of which have finished area, central air conditioning, one to three fireplaces, and a garage ranging in size from 567 to 839 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from February 2021 to May 2022 for prices ranging from \$765,000 to \$857,000 or from \$165.27 to \$204.63 per square foot of living area, including land.

The board of review submitted a brief from the township assessor's office contending the subject should be assessed as a brick home rather than a frame with brick home, which will result in a higher assessment that will be corrected by a certificate of error to \$292,580. It was argued the appellant's comparables differ from the subject in number of fixtures, basement finish, exterior construction, and inground swimming pool amenity.

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. Adm. 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. Adm. 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 Board further finds the evidence does not support an increase in the subject's assessment.

The record contains a total of eight comparable sales, with one common sale, and evidence of an August 2021 sale of the subject for the Board's consideration. The Board gives less weight to the subject's August 2021, the appellant's comparables #1, #3, and #5, and the board of review's

¹ 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. Adm. 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 2023.

² The board of review submitted five comparables but reported sales data for only four comparables.

comparables #2, #3, and #4, which sold less proximate in time to the assessment date than the other sales in this record.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the appellant's comparable #1/board of review's comparable #2 and the appellant's comparable #4, which sold more proximate in time to the assessment date and are similar to the subject in dwelling size, age, location, and most features, although these comparables each lack an inground swimming pool that is a feature of the subject, have no or less brick exterior construction than the subject, and have no or less finished basement area than the subject, suggesting upward adjustments to these comparables would be needed to make them more equivalent to the subject. Moreover, one comparable has a much larger site than the subject, suggesting an downward adjustment for this feature to this property would be needed. These two most similar comparables sold for prices of \$722,502 and \$845,000 or \$144.21 and \$165.27 per square foot of living area, including land, respectively. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$849,091 or \$161.67 per square foot of living area, including land, which is above the two best comparable sales in terms of total market value, but is bracketed by the best comparables on a per square foot basis. Based on this evidence and after considering appropriate adjustments to the best comparables for differences from the subject, the Board finds the subject's assessment is reflective of its fair cash value and a change 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: _____

October 15, 2024



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

Labib Khanafer, by attorney:
Gregory Riggs
Tax Appeals Lake County
830 West IL Route 22
Suite 286
Lake Zurich, IL 60047

COUNTY

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