

**CALGARY  
ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD  
DECISION WITH REASONS**

In the matter of the complaint against the Property/Business assessment as provided by the *Municipal Government Act*, Chapter M-26, Section 460(4).

**between:**

***J.D. Sheridan (Linnell Taylor Assessment Strategies), COMPLAINANT***

**and**

***The City Of Calgary, RESPONDENT***

**before:**

***M. A. Vercillo, PRESIDING OFFICER  
S. Rourke, MEMBER***

This is a complaint to the Calgary Assessment Review Board in respect of Property assessment prepared by the Assessor of The City of Calgary and entered in the 2010 Assessment Roll as follows:

**ROLL NUMBER: 060078904**

**LOCATION ADDRESS: 2540 KENSINGTON RD NW**

**HEARING NUMBER: 55991**

**ASSESSMENT: \$4,650,000**

This complaint was heard on 24th day of June, 2010 at the office of the Assessment Review Board located at Floor Number 3, 1212 – 31 Avenue NE, Calgary, Alberta, Boardroom #12.

Appeared on behalf of the Complainant:

- *Mr. J.D Sheridan (Linnell Taylor & Assessment Strategies)*

Appeared on behalf of the Respondent:

- *Ms. K. Moore*

**Board's Decision in Respect of Procedural or Jurisdictional Matters:**

Not Applicable

**Property Description:**

The subject property known as UMA Building is a 2 and 1/2 story suburban office building completed in 1970 and located in the Kensington district and west of Crowchild Trail in NW Calgary. The building has a net rentable area of approximately 28,500 square feet (SF) including 7,125 SF of "Below Grade" Office space and 21,375 SF of Office space. The building is situated on an assessable land area of approximately 10,422 SF.

**Issues:**

- 1) Assessment is excessive because the Respondent did not use appropriate coefficients, namely:
  - a) Rental rates,
  - b) Vacancy rate, and
  - c) Capitalization rate,in his Income Approach to value.

**Complainant's Requested Value:**

\$4,050,000.

**Board's Decision in Respect of Each Matter or Issue:**

**Issue #1- Rental Rates:**

The Complainant provides the subject property's current lease arrangements taken from the subject's Assessment Request For Information (ARFI) that was previously submitted to the Assessor's office. In addition he compares the subject to nearby buildings as direct comparables for lease rates. He concludes that the appropriate lease rates for the subject are \$15.00 per SF for office space and \$9.00 for below grade office space.

The Respondent provides a summary of "B" Class suburban office and retail space lease rates for buildings within the same or similar assessable district as the subject. The lease rates have a range of \$9.71 per SF to \$22.50 per SF for office space but are for smaller office spaces. The

median rate per SF is \$18.00 for office space. The Respondent concludes that the appropriate lease rates for the subject are \$17.00 per SF for office space and \$9.00 for below grade office space. The Respondent also provided an independent company's (Altus) study of the rental rate market for Class B buildings in northwest Calgary. The study shows that the average rental rate asking price for similar buildings to the subject is \$19.68 per SF for quarter 2 of 2009.

The Board finds that by focussing on the 2009 rental rates provided by the Respondent for office space there is adequate evidence to support the Respondent's rental rates of \$17.00 per SF for office space. The Complainant's Rebuttal package failed to dissuade the Board from this conclusion.

#### Issue #2 - Vacancy Rate:

The Complainant is requesting a vacancy rate of 3.50% be applied to the subject based on various independent studies of Class B buildings with particular weighting on 2009 rates.

The Respondent uses a 6.00% vacancy rate in her Income Approach to value. The Respondent claims the 6% rate is consistently applied to similar buildings in the same assessable area.

The Board finds in favour of the Respondent for reasons of consistency and also finds that the higher vacancy rate used by the Respondent actually favours the Complainant in the Income Approach to value.

#### Issue #3 - Capitalization Rate:

The Complainant is requesting a capitalization rate (Cap Rate) of 8.75% be applied to the subject based on an independent study of Class B buildings by Colliers International with particular weighting on 2009 rates. The study shows that in 2009 the Cap Rate was 8.00% to 8.50% for Quarter 1, 8.50% to 9.00% for Quarter 2 and 8.25% to 9.00% for Quarter 3. In support of the Complainant's Cap Rate request of 8.75% the Complainant provided five sales comparables of properties that sold in the first half of 2009.

The Respondent also provides the Colliers International Cap study but also provided other similar independent studies done by CB Richard Ellis (CBRE) and Altus. The CBRE study showed a Cap Rate range of 7.00% for 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter 2008, to 9.00% for 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter 2009. The Altus study showed a Cap Rate range of 8.10% to 8.30% for 1st quarter 2009. The Respondent claims that unlike the Complainant who focussed on 2009 data for Cap Rates, the Respondent sample of data included the entire assessment year (2<sup>nd</sup> quarter 2008, to 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter 2009). The Respondent claims that an 8.00% Cap Rate is more appropriate for the subject and is consistently applied to similar properties within the same assessable area.

After considering all the evidence submitted by each party in support of their respective positions on Cap Rates, the Board finds that a rate of 8.50% is reasonable for the subject when considering its age and location in comparison to other properties with emphasis on 2009 data.

**Board's Decision:**

The Board finds that in using rental rate of \$17.00 per SF for office space and \$9.00 for below grade office space; a vacancy rate of 6.00%; and a Cap Rate of 8.50%; and using the Income Approach to value, the revised assessment is **\$4,380,000**

DATED AT THE CITY OF CALGARY THIS 14 DAY OF July 2010.

  
Michael A. Vercillo

Presiding Officer

*An appeal may be made to the Court of Queen's Bench on a question of law or jurisdiction with respect to a decision of an assessment review board.*

*Any of the following may appeal the decision of an assessment review board:*

- (a) the complainant;*
- (b) an assessed person, other than the complainant, who is affected by the decision;*
- (c) the municipality, if the decision being appealed relates to property that is within the boundaries of that municipality;*
- (d) the assessor for a municipality referred to in clause (c).*

*An application for leave to appeal must be filed with the Court of Queen's Bench within 30 days after the persons notified of the hearing receive the decision, and notice of the application for leave to appeal must be given to*

- (a) the assessment review board, and*
- (b) any other persons as the judge directs.*