

**CALGARY
COMPOSITE 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:

L.R. Loven, PRESIDING OFFICER

B. Kodak, MEMBER

T. Usselman, MEMBER

This is a complaint to the Calgary Combined 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: 057194805

LOCATION ADDRESS: 111 11 Avenue N.E.

HEARING NUMBER: 59939

ASSESSMENT: 1,580,000

This complaint was heard on the 28th day of October, 2010 at the office of the Assessment Review Board located at Floor Number 4, 1212 – 31 Avenue NE, Calgary, Alberta, Boardroom 9.

Appeared on behalf of the Complainant:

- B. Neeson, representing Altus Group Limited, on behalf of Real Equity Ventures Inc.

Appeared on behalf of the Respondent:

- J. Toogood, representing the City of Calgary

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

Both the Respondent and the Complainant confirmed to the Board that they had no procedural or jurisdictional matters to be raised.

Property Description:

The subject property consists of a 1.5 story, 8 suite townhouse, built in 1977, and located in the Crescent Heights (CRE) community within market zone 3. The assessment is \$1,580,000.

Issues:

1. Vacancy rate increased to 5%; and,
2. Gross Income multiplier (GIM) decreased to 13.

Complainant's Requested Value: \$1,300,000.

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

Issue 1: Vacancy Rate

The Complainant provided a table containing six equity comparables as follows: four highrise comparables; and, two lowrise comparables, one lowrise comparable located in market zone 3 in a different community than the subject property and the other in market zone 2 were assessed vacancy rates of 1% and 2%, respectively. Whereas, two highrise comparables located in market zone 3 were assessed at a vacancy rate of 5%, and two highrise comparables located in market zone 2 were assessed at 1% vacancy.

The Complainant submitted a CMHC Rental Market Report for Fall 2009 showing the total townhouse vacancy rate in zone 3, in which the subject property is located, as 9.8% for October 2009. The Board notes that no change in vacancy rate for one bedroom units is noted.

The Respondent provided a table containing three assessment comparables, all located with market zone 3, ranging in age from 38 years older to the same age as the subject property, with from 3 fewer to 12 more suites, and all assessed at a vacancy of 0.97 (the same as the subject property).

The Respondent referenced Calgary Assessment Review Board decision ARB 0536/2010-P, regarding the vacancy rate for a low-rise apartment building located in the Beltline community

Based on its consideration of the foregoing evidence and argument, the Board finds that CMHC report provides the Board with information regarding the vacancy rate for townhouse apartments in market zone 3; however, the Respondent's assessment comparables and the Complainant's townhouse comparables both support the assessed vacancy rate of 3%.

Issue 2: GIM

The Complainant's equity comparables, five located in market zone 2 and containing from 16 to 38 suites, constructed from 1962 to 1980 are all assessed at a GIM of 13 which is lower than that of the subject property by a GIM of 2.5.

The Respondent's three assessment comparables, as described above, are all assessed at a GIM of 15.5 (the same as the subject property).

Based on its consideration of the foregoing evidence and argument, the Board finds that the comparables provided by the Respondent, are more similar to the subject property in location, number of units, and year of construction than the Complainant's comparables; therefore, the Complainant's comparables better support the assessed GIM of the subject property.

Summary

The only issues argued by the Complainant were to increase the assessed vacancy rate from .97 or 3% to .95 or 5%, and decrease the GIM from 15.5 to 13.

The Board finds that the Calgary Assessment Review Board decision ARB WR0083/2010-P referenced by the Complainant, regarding the lowering of an assessment for a single family property, has little merit given the decision was based, in part, on the change in assessment of the Respondent's comparables in the same community. However, the Complainant provided a table containing four highrise and two lowrise comparables, containing from 16 to 38 units, not located in the same community as the subject property. The percent change in the assessment for the subject property was approximately -2.44%, versus from -6% to -20% for the comparables. Given the foregoing, on this basis alone it is difficult for the Board to find that the assessment of the subject property should be reduced.

The CMHC report submitted by the Complainant did not provide the Board with any details for the Board to determine that the vacancy rate rose for one bedroom townhouse apartments in market zone 3.

The Complainant's comparables support the assessment of the subject property regarding vacancy rate.

The Respondent's assessment comparables support the assessed vacancy rate of 3% and assessed GIM of 15.5.

In conclusion, the Board therefore finds, based on its consideration of the evidence and argument given, that the subject property appears to have been assessed fairly with respect to vacancy rate and GIM.

Board's Decision:

For the reasons set forth above, the assessment of the subject property is hereby confirmed as follows: \$1,580,000.

DATED AT THE CITY OF CALGARY THIS 9 DAY OF December 2010.



L.R. LOVEN
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.*