



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

APPELLANT: GGC Ventures, LLC
DOCKET NO.: 17-43152.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 20-26-125-011-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are GGC Ventures, LLC, the appellant, by attorney Abby L. Strauss, of Schiller Law P.C., in Chicago, and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented in this matter, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds **A Reduction** in the assessment of the property as established by the **Cook** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$ 910
IMPR.: \$1,690
TOTAL: \$2,600

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Cook County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2017 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 1.5-story dwelling of masonry exterior construction with approximately 1,296 square feet of living area.¹ The dwelling was built in 1885 and is approximately 127 years old. Features of the home include a full unfinished basement, central air conditioning and a one-car garage.² The property has a 3,125 square foot site and is located in Chicago, Hyde Park Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-03 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

¹ The appellant in Section III of the Residential Appeal petition described the subject as a two-story dwelling containing 1,546 square feet whereas the board of review reported the property is a 1.5-story that contains 1,296 square feet of living area. Given the nature of the evidence in this proceeding, the Board finds that these factual discrepancies do not prevent a determination of the correct assessment on this record

² Again, the parties disagree on air conditioning and garage features with the board of review reporting neither for the subject dwelling. Neither party provided a property record card or other detailed data to support their respective descriptions of the subject.

The appellant's appeal is based on overvaluation. In support of this argument, the appellant completed Section IV – Recent Sale Data of the appeal petition reporting that the subject property was purchased on March 21, 2017. The property was purchased from Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the appellant reported that the parties to the transaction were not related. The property was advertised with the Multiple Listing Service (MLS) for a period of 30 weeks. In further support, the appellant submitted copies of the MLS data sheet depicting an original asking price of \$32,000 and a listing period of 30 days; a copy of the Settlement Statement depicting the seller as HUD and the purchase price as \$26,000 on March 21, 2017 with the distribution of a commission to VIP Real Estate Ltd. as part of the sale; and a copy of the Special Warranty Deed transferring the property. The listing sheet described the property being sold as-is and "plumbing failed to hold pressure at time of initial inspection." Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to reflect the purchase price at the 10% level of assessment for class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$8,844. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$88,440 or \$68.24 per square foot of living area, including land, when applying the level of assessment for class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance of 10%.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review reported that the subject property was purchased in March 2017 for \$26,000 or \$20.06 per square foot of living area, including land, and submitted information on four comparable sales, three of which are located within the same neighborhood code as the subject. Two of the comparables were within the subarea of the subject and two were within ¼ of a mile of the subject. The comparables had lots ranging in size from 2,975 to 3,750 square feet of land area and were improved with one-story class 2-03 or 2-02 dwellings of frame or masonry exterior construction. The comparables range in size from 968 to 1,080 square feet of living area and range in age from 57 to 101 years old. Three comparables have full unfinished basements and one comparable has a concrete slab foundation. Two comparables have either a one-car or a two-car garage, respectively. The comparables sold from November 2015 to September 2017 for prices ranging from \$125,000 to \$167,000 or from \$115.74 to \$172.52 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.

In rebuttal, counsel for the appellant argued that the sales presented by the board of review did not come from a verified source or reflect adjustments for differences in size, location, age, bathroom county, condition, amenities and/or date of sale. The appellant reiterated the contention that the recent sale of subject is indicative of its fair market value and further argued that the subject was actively listed on the MLS.

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 met this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The appellant submitted data concerning the 2017 purchase price of the subject property and the board of review submitted four suggested comparable sales, along with acknowledging the subject's date of purchase and sale price, in support of their respective positions before the Property Tax Appeal Board. The Board has given little weight to the board of review comparables.

On this record, the Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the purchase of the subject property in March 2017 for a price of \$26,000 or \$20.06 per square foot of living area, including land. The appellant provided evidence demonstrating the sale had the elements of an arm's length transaction. The appellant completed Section IV - Recent Sale Data of the appeal disclosing the parties to the transaction were not related, the property was sold using a Realtor, the property had been advertised on the open market with the Multiple Listing Service for an initial asking price of \$32,000, it had been on the market for 30 days and it sold for less than the asking price. The listing further indicated that there may be plumbing issues, thus the condition of the subject property has been called into question along with an offering in as-is condition. In further support of the transaction, the appellant submitted a copy of the Settlement Statement, the MLS listing sheet and the Special Warranty Deed. The Board finds the purchase price of \$26,000 is below the market value reflected by the assessment of \$88,440.

Furthermore, the Board finds the board of review did not present any substantive evidence to challenge the arm's length nature of the transaction or to refute the contention that the purchase price was reflective of market value at the time of sale. A contemporaneous sale between two parties dealing at arm's length is not only relevant to the question of fair cash value but practically conclusive on the issue on whether the assessment is reflective of market value. Korzen v. Belt Railway Co. of Chicago, 37 Ill.2d 158 (1967). Furthermore, the sale of a property during the tax year in question is a relevant factor in considering the validity of the assessment. Rosewell v. 2626 Lakeview Limited Partnership, 120 Ill.App.3d 369, 375 (1st Dist. 1983).

As to the comparable sales presented by the board of review reduced weight would be afforded to each of the comparables due to a date sale from 2015, differences in age, foundation and/or dwelling size when compared to the subject.

In conclusion, based on this record, the Board finds the subject property is overvalued given its recent purchase price that was not adequately refuted and, therefore, the Board finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is 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: June 8, 2021



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

GGC Ventures, LLC, by attorney:
Abby L. Strauss
Schiller Law P.C.
33 North Dearborn
Suite 1130
Chicago, IL 60602

COUNTY

Cook County Board of Review
County Building, Room 601
118 North Clark Street
Chicago, IL 60602