

**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-26.1, Section 460(4).

**between:**

***Assessment Advisory Group, COMPLAINANT***

**and**

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

**before:**

***H. Kim, PRESIDING OFFICER***

***A. Blake, MEMBER***

***S. Rourke, MEMBER***

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

<b>ROLL NUMBER:</b>	<b>445109606</b>
<b>LOCATION ADDRESS:</b>	<b>20 Country Hills Landing NW</b>
<b>HEARING NUMBER:</b>	<b>58667</b>
<b>ASSESSMENT:</b>	<b>\$2,910,000</b>

This complaint was heard on the 20<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2010 at the office of the Assessment Review Board located at the 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, 1212 – 31 Avenue NE, Calgary, Alberta, Boardroom 4.

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

One of the pages in the Complainant's package had information cut off due to incorrect alignment of the printer. The Complainant requested that a replacement page be accepted. The original disclosure was sent electronically and the page was intact, this defect only affected the packages presented at the hearing. With the concurrence of the Respondent the replacement page was accepted and entered into evidence.

**Property Description:**

The subject property is a multiple tenant industrial warehouse on a corner lot in the Country Hills district in the Northwest zone constructed in 2000. It consists of 15,113 SF rentable area with 58% finish on a 0.97 ac parcel designated Direct Control (DC). Building footprint is 10,106 SF for site coverage of 24.01%. It is assessed on the sales comparable approach at \$193/SF.

**Issues:**

The Complainant identified a number of issues on the Complaint form; however at the hearing the only issue argued and considered was whether the assessment reflected market value.

**Complainant's Requested Value:** \$2,260,000 revised to \$2,530,716 at the hearing

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

**Complainant's position:**

The Complainant had determined that the assessment of the subject was \$214/SF based on rentable area of 13,606 SF reported on Assessment Summary Report available on the Respondent's website. The Complainant presented three sales of comparable properties in the Northwest zone (Royal Vista and Bowness) of warehouses between 11,520 and 21,227 SF net rentable area, built 1976 to 2006, that sold between May 2008 and September 2009. They had site coverage of 27 to 69% with sale prices of \$108/SF to \$276/SF. With adjustments for sale date, building size, site coverage and age, the indicated value of the subject is \$186/SF, the basis for the requested value.

**Respondent's position:**

The Respondent noted that in fact the rentable area is 15,113 SF as noted on the Assessment Explanation Supplement. The discrepancy could not be explained but there is sometimes erroneous information posted on the website. The assessment of the subject is \$193/SF, not \$214 as presented by the Complainant. The Respondent disputed the relevance of the Complainant's sales: Bowness is not at all a comparable location to the subject, and the sale in Royal Vista, at \$276/SF supports the assessment.

The Respondent presented four sales in the Northeast zone of warehouses between 10,750 and 22,300 SF net rentable area, built 1973 to 2006, that sold between August 2007 and January 2009. They had site coverage of 11.61 to 27.00% with 10 to 50% finish and time

adjusted sale prices (TASPs) of \$188/SF to \$258/SF. The median TASP is \$216 which supports the assessment of the subject at \$193/SF.

**Decision and Reasons:**

The Board agreed that the more detailed Assessment Explanation Supplement would have the correct rentable area, and that the assessment under complaint was \$193/SF. The only sale that the Board considered to be truly comparable was presented by both parties: the May 2008 sale in Royal Vista. It is considerably larger than the subject, but newer which would tend to balance the adjustments, and has similar site coverage and % finish. It sold for a TASP of \$258/SF. On balance, in the absence of better comparables, the sales support the assessment of the subject property.

**Board's Decision:**

The complaint is denied and the assessment confirmed at \$2,910,000.

DATED AT THE CITY OF CALGARY THIS 26<sup>th</sup> DAY OF October 2010.



H. Kim  
Presiding Officer

**APPENDIX "A"**

**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AND CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD:**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>ITEM</b>
C1	Complaint Form
C2	Complainant's submission
C3	Replacement page 8
R1	Respondent's submission

**APPENDIX 'B'**

**ORAL REPRESENTATIONS**

**PERSON APPEARING    CAPACITY**

Troy Howell	Assessment Advisory Group, Complainant
George Bell	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.*