ARB 1358/2010-P

CALGARY ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD DECISION WITH REASONS

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

between:

Altus Group Limited, COMPLAINANT

and

The City Of Calgary, RESPONDENT

before:

H. Kim, PRESIDING OFFICER J. Rankin, MEMBER E. Reuther, 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 NUMBERS	LOCATION ADDRESSES	HEARING NUMBERS	ASSESSMENTS
090059502	3629 Macleod Tr. SW	56351	337,500
090059601	3625 Macleod Tr. SW	56355	337,000
090059700	3623 Macleod Tr. SW	56358	337,000
111096707	517 67 Ave SW	56422	1,550,000
111184206	612 67 Ave SW	56431	6,400,000
111180303	7370 4A St SW	58923	1,880,000

Page 2 of 7

This complaint was heard on the 30th day of August, 2010 at the office of the Assessment Review Board located at Floor Number Four, 1212 – 31 Avenue NE, Calgary, Alberta, Boardroom 1.

Property Description:

The subject complaints are of vacant parcels along Macleod Trail South with varying parcel sizes, zonings and influences. They are all assessed based on vacant land at market value using a base rate of \$85 per square foot. Influences applied to some of the parcels are +5% Corner Lot (CRL), -25% Topography (TOP), and -25% Limited Access (ACC). Traffic influences (TRM, TRE, and ACD) are coded but do not have a percent influence applied. Details of each parcel are as follows (from the 2010 Non-Residential Vacant Land Summary for each parcel):

Roll No.	Address	Area (SF)	Influences	% Adj.	Zoning
090059502	3629 Macleod Tr. SW	5,492	TOP TRM ACD	-25	C-COR2
090059601	3625 Macleod Tr. SW	5,492	TOP TRM ACD	-25	C-COR2
090059700	3623 Macleod Tr. SW	5,492	TOP TRM ACD	-25	C-COR2
111096707	517 67 Ave SW	18,287			C-COR3
111184206	612 67 Ave SW	71,798	TRE CRL	+5	C-COR3
111180303	7370 4A St SW	27,772	CRL ACC	-20	C-COR3

Issues:

The Complainant identified several issues on the Complaint forms, but at the hearing the two issues argued and considered were:

1. Does the base land rate applied in the assessments reflect market value at July 1, 2009?

2. Are the parcels assessed equitably with other similar properties in the area?

Complainant's Requested Values:

ROLL	LOCATION ADDRESSES	HEARING	REQUESTED AS	
NUMBERS		NUMBERS	ORIGINAL	REVISED
090059502	3629 Macleod Tr. SW	56351	240,000	206,000
090059601	3625 Macleod Tr. SW	56355	240,000	205,000
090059700	3623 Macleod Tr. SW	56358	240,000	205,000
111096707	517 67 Ave SW	56422	1,200,000	914,000
111184206	612 67 Ave SW	56431	5,000,000	3,589,000
111180303	7370 4A St SW	58923	1,200,000	1,110,000

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

Issue 1: Market Value

Complainant's Position

There were no sales of vacant C-COR land on Macleod Trail South in the relevant time period. The City's base land value of \$85 per square foot was derived from improved sales that were deemed to be land value transactions. An analysis of the sales that occurred does not support a market rate of \$85. The Complainant presented four sales of properties with low site

Page 3 of 7

CARB 1358/2010-P

coverage that occurred between March 2008 and November 2009:

				Land Area		Sale	
#	Address	Property use	Bldg Size	(SF)	Sale Price	Date	Rate/SF
C1	4001-4007 Macleod Tr	Retail, gas bar (7/11)	8,627	58,806	3,500,000	Mar-08	59.52
C2	6808 Macleod Tr	Mr. Lube, restaurant	8,958	44,866	1,800,000	May-08	40.12
СЗ	9950 Macleod Tr	Multi-tenant retail	54,194	194,277	13,800,000	Sep-08	71.03
C4	7212 Macleod Tr	Former MacDonalds	6,819	44,866	2,900,000	Nov-09	64.64

The sales support a base land value rate of between \$40 and \$70 per square foot. Values declined between the sale dates and the valuation date of July 1, 2009. Sale # 4 is post-facto; however values were flat between July and November 2009. The requested value is \$50/SF.

Respondent's Position

C-COR land city-wide is assessed at \$107/SF for the first 10,000 square feet and \$17/SF for the balance. There is no distinction between C-COR1, 2 and 3. Macleod Trail was analyzed separately. There was one vacant land sale, at 8306 Horton Road at \$100/SF in November 2008 notwithstanding the Complainant's position that there were none, and the Complainant did not present all of the sales on Macleod Trail in the relevant time period. The sale at 6808 Macleod Trail was not an arms length sale. In addition to the ones presented by the Complainant, the following sales occurred on Macleod Trail:

#	Address	Property use	Land Area (SF)	Sale Price	Sale Date	Rate/SF
R1	5307A Macleod Tr	Hotel	44,431	5,500,000	May-08	124
R2	5720A Macleod Tr	Office, retail	31,363	3,500,000	Nov-09	112
R3	8306 Horton Road SW	Vacant	200,865	20,100,000	Nov-08	100
R4	3911 Macleod Tr	Auto sales	31,860	3,209,000	May-08	101
R5	4715 Macleod Tr	Car wash	28,266	3,430,000	Jan-08	121

There were not enough sales to analyze whether zoning affected the sale price, but it did not appear to be the case, therefore the land rates were not adjusted based on zoning. The Respondent recognizes that some of the sales need to be time adjusted, however there were not enough sales on Macleod Trail South to determine a time adjustment, so the land rates in the Beltline and Downtown were considered, as there was some comparability to Macleod Trail rates in those areas. The 2010 assessments compared to 2009 for the Downtown and Beltline declined 11.4% and 20.5% respectively, therefore Macleod Trail South land rates were reduced by 15%, the average of the two. Unsold listings are not market value, but can be an indicator of value. The Respondent referred to several listings on Macleod Trail with asking rates per square foot of \$100 to \$230. On balance these also support the assessment.

Decision and Reasons:

The Board did not agree that any conclusion could be drawn from the asking prices of unsold listings, other than the market value is lower than the asking price. The Board reviewed the sales presented, and determined that some of the Respondent's sales had substantial improvements and were not comparable. Sale R1 is a 50-room hotel, sale R2 has 28,566 SF building area on two levels, and sale R5 had a 12,516 SF car wash. The Respondent considers these to be land value sales because they sold for more than the capitalized income stream; however the Board does not agree that it necessarily follows the sale prices represented the

Page 4 of 7

vacant land values. Sale R3 drove the vacant land values for the 2009 and 2010 assessments, but on reviewing the details of the sale and the approved development permit, the Board is of the opinion that the sale price reflected not only the value of the land but also a project in its final planning stages. Further, the Complainant stated the Direct Control zoning on that parcel allowed substantially higher density than what would be permitted for the subject parcels. While the Respondent does not adjust for density or location along Macleod Trail, the Board was persuaded by the Complainant that such factors would affect the market value.

Accepting the Respondent's position that C2 is not a valid sale, the Board found that sales C1, C3, C4 and R4 were more likely to have reflected vacant land value. The average of the 3 sales in 2008 is \$77.18/SF. The Respondent's time adjustment of -15% applied to this value is \$65.60/SF. This is supported by the November 2009 sale at \$64.64/SF which, while post facto, supports the conclusion that can be drawn from the other sales. Therefore the Board finds that the market value of vacant land on Macleod Trail South at the valuation date was in the order of \$65/SF and not \$85/SF as used in the assessment.

Issue 2: Equity

Complainant's Position

The Complainant analyzed the assessments of 72 improved properties on Macleod Trail between 36th and 96th Avenues and compared them to their parcel sizes. The assessments per square foot ranged from \$16 to \$81/SF of land area, with a mean of \$51 and a median of \$49. The value of a property cannot be less than the value of the land on which it is located; therefore the assessments of vacant parcels are inequitable with other parcels in the municipality. This position is further illustrated by the assessments of the sales that were used in the market value analysis:

#	Address	Land Area (SF)	Sale Price	Sale Date	Sale Price/SF	2010 Assessment/SF
C1	4001-4007 Macleod Tr	58,806	3,500,000	Mar-08	59.52	44.00
C2	6808 Macleod Tr	44,866	1,800,000	May-08	40.12	41.00
C3	9950 Macleod Tr	194,277	13,800,000	Sep-08	71.03	39.00
C4	7212 Macleod Tr	44,866	2,900,000	Nov-09	64.64	47.00

Recent Board decisions reducing assessments were presented to support the Complainant's position that the base rate should be reduced to maintain equity. The comparables support a reduction of the base rate to \$50/SF.

Respondent's Position

In preparing the assessment, properties were stratified into classes. Vacant land was assessed based on sales comparables and income producing property was assessed on its capitalized income stream. Land values have increased drastically such that some income producing properties have vacant land as their highest and best use. Assessment on the income stream has caused some of the income-producing properties to be undervalued.

The Respondent presented 14 vacant land assessments along Macleod Trail to demonstrate that all vacant land is assessed at the \$85/SF base rate and therefore are equitably assessed with each other.

Page 5 of 7

Decision and Reasons:

The Act requires the assessment to be equitable:

293(1) In preparing an assessment, the assessor must, in a fair and equitable manner,(a) apply the valuation and other standards set out in the regulations, ...

In order to determine the similarity of the Complainant's equity comparables, the Board considered the assessments per square foot of land looking at properties in the vicinity of the parcels under complainant and in the same range of parcel size:

Properties under 15,000 SF land area near 3623-3629 Macleod Trail

Roll #	Address	Land Area (SF)	Assessment	\$/SF Land
090077801	4002 Macleod Tr	11,932	684,500	57
090032103	4101 Macleod Tr	14,349	625,000	44
090077504	4108 Macleod Tr	11,485	402,500	35
090035403	4701 Macleod Tr	11,438	642,500	56
090048497	4812 Macleod Tr	12,427	888,000	71
101022408	5316 Macleod Tr	11,945	598,000	50
Mean				52
Median				53

Properties between 11,000 and 35,000 SF land area near 67 Ave and Macleod Trail

Roll #	Address	Land Area (SF)	Assessment	\$/SF Land
101028504	5702 Macleod Tr	16,749	883,500	53
101029406	5808 Macleod Tr	26,650	1,860,000	70
101046407	6606 Macleod Tr	31,432	2,380,000	76
101048308	6666 Macleod Tr	26,372	948,000	36
111035101	7007 Macleod Tr	19,347	916,000	47
111177200	7215 Macleod Tr	33,762	1,280,000	38
111162202	7425 Macleod Tr	23,980	1,910,000	80
200790301	8455 Macleod Tr	27,987	594,500	21
200790319	8508 Macleod Tr	32,293	1,300,000	40
Mean				51
Median				47

Properties between 44,000 and 120,000 SF land area near 67 Ave and Macleod Trail

Roll #	Address	Land Area (SF)	Assessment	\$/SF Land
112001508	6712 Macleod Tr	45,017	2,590,000	58
112001607	6808 Macleod Tr	45,007	2,090,000	46
112105408	7004 Macleod Tr	67,293	4,430,000	66
112105903	7104 Macleod Tr	112,487	7,870,000	70
011177002	7109 Macleod Tr	44,847	2,300,000	51
112106604	7212 Macleod Tr	44,977	2,130,000	47
112108907	7400 Macleod Tr	118,299	8,360,000	71
112108808	7516 Macleod Tr	61,787	1,690,000	27
112060306	7520 Macleod Tr	73,950	3,430,000	46
112060405	7730 Macleod Tr	44,059	1,870,000	42
112060504	7810 Macleod Tr	79,399	1,700,000	21
1124063819	9223 Macleod Tr	64,370	2,390,000	37
1124188806	9609 Macleod Tr	73,721	1,160,000	16
Mean				46
Median				46

Page 6 of 7

In every range of parcel size the improved properties have values per square foot of land in the range of the \$50 requested by the Complainant. The minimum value of the fee simple estate in an income-producing property is its vacant land value. The Complainant demonstrated inequity between neighbouring properties in the municipality. The Board does not agree that stratification into classes makes it acceptable for income producing properties to be assessed at a level far below vacant land.

Fairness and equity as a fundamental principle of municipal taxation was first established in *Jonas v. Gilbert* (1881, Supreme Court of Canada) and further detailed in *Assessor for Area 9 – Vancouver v. Bramalea Limited* (1990 B.C. Court of Appeal). It is clearly articulated in *Strathcona No. 20 (County) v. Alberta (Assessment Appeal Board)* (1995 Alberta Court of Appeal):

The foregoing provisions of the Municipal Taxation Act reflect the two fundamental principles of municipal taxation in Canada, firstly, that property be assessed on the common basis of fair actual value so that the cost of municipal government will fairly be borne by taxpayers inter se in proportion to the relative values of their assessable properties and, secondly, that the assessor shall determine the fair actual value in a manner that is fair and equitable with the level of value prescribed for use in determining the fair actual value of other like improvements in the municipality.

The Board finds that to preserve equity, the base land rate should be reduced to \$50/SF.

Board's Decision:

Sales comparison supports market value of vacant land at \$65/SF. Equity with similar properties supports a rate of \$50/SF. Both market value and equity support a reduction, however the Board is of the opinion that the direction to be taken from the jurisprudence supports the application of the lower rate.

Therefore, the complaints are allowed, and the assessments reduced as follows based on \$50/SF, with influence adjustments (as applied and not under dispute):

Roll No.	Address	Area (SF)	Value @ \$50/SF	% Adj.	Assessment
090059502	3629 Macleod Tr. SW	5,492	274,600	-25	206,000
090059601	3625 Macleod Tr. SW	5,492	274,600	-25	206,000
090059700	3623 Macleod Tr. SW	5,492	274,600	-25	206,000
111096707	517 67 Ave SW	18,287	914,350		914,000
111184206	612 67 Ave SW	71,798	3,589,900	+5	3,760,000
111180303	7370 4A St SW	27,772	1,388,600	-20	1,110,000

DATED AT THE CITY OF CALGARY THIS 9th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2010.

Presiding Officer

Page 7 of 7

CARB 1358/2010-P

APPENDIX "A"

DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AND CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD:

<u>NO.</u>	ITEM
C1	Complainant Form
C2	Complainant's Submission (specific for each parcel)
C3	Sales details, equity comparables and argument
C4	Complainant's rebuttal of Respondent's submission
C5	Board Order ARB 0958/2010 August 4, 2010
C6	Board Order ARB 0867/2010 July 22, 2010
R1	Respondent's Submission

APPENDIX 'B"

ORAL REPRESENTATIONS

PERSON APPEARING CAPACITY

Reid Hutchinson	Altus Group Limited, Complainant
Darryl Genereux	Altus Group Limited, Complainant
Elessio D'Altorio	Assessor, City of Calgary, Respondent

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.