

**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-26.1, Section 460(4).

**between:**

***Altus Group Ltd., COMPLAINANT***

**and**

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

**before:**

***C. Griffin, PRESIDING OFFICER***

***D. Julien, MEMBER***

***J. Mathias, MEMBER***

This is a complaint to the Composite Assessment Review Board (CARB) in respect of 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>067058511</b>
<b>LOCATION ADDRESS:</b>	<b>609 8 St SW</b>
<b>HEARING NUMBER:</b>	<b>60229</b>
<b>ASSESSMENT:</b>	<b>\$107,790,000</b>
<b>Residential:</b>	<b>94.85%</b>
<b>Non-Residential:</b>	<b>5.15%</b>

This complaint was heard on 23rd day of November, 2010 at the office of the Calgary Assessment Review Board located at Floor Number 4, 1212 – 31 Avenue NE, Calgary, Alberta, Boardroom 6.

Appeared on behalf of the Complainant:

- *J. Weber* *Agent, Altus Group Ltd.*

Appeared on behalf of the Respondent:

- *J. Toogood* *Assessor, The City of Calgary*

**Procedural or Jurisdictional Matters:**

Both parties acknowledged that the issue and evidence was identical to a prior hearing (59903) for a Beltline apartment building at 123 10 Avenue SW. The referenced hearing took place in front of the same CARB panel on November 12, 2010 and the Complainant's evidence was also presented by Mr. Weber, with Ms. Bazin present for the Respondent. The only issue under complaint was the Gross Income Multiplier (GIM).

Accordingly, both parties were satisfied with providing their evidence as written submissions only, carrying forward their argument and comments from hearing 59903.

No site-specific oral testimony was given on the files at hand.

**Property Description:**

The subject is the largest high-rise rental property in the city, known as Calgary Place Apartments. It is located in the western downtown district, between 8 Street and 9 Street SW. The complex consists of two 36 storey buildings with 294 suites in one and 303 suites in the other. Built in 1969, it contains a combined suite mix of 204 bachelor, 251 one bedroom, 136 two bedroom and 6 three bedroom units. These are assessed with rental rates of \$1,050, \$1,150, \$1,300 and \$1,700 per month respectively. A 5.00% vacancy allowance and 13.00 Gross Income Multiplier (GIM) was applied to arrive at the current assessment for the residential portion. Additionally, there is a commercial component on the main floor consisting of 18,303 square feet of retail space assessed at \$275 per square foot and 2,605 square feet of office space at \$200 per square foot. This property is assessed as "Average Plus" quality. The residential assessment amounts to \$102,235,770 (94.85%) and the non-residential assessment amounts to \$5,554,325 (5.15%). The combined 2010 assessment is truncated to \$107,790,000.

**Issues:**

While there are a number of inter-related grounds for complaint identified on the complaint form, at the Hearing the Complainant confirmed, as identified on page 3 of Exhibit C-1, that there are only two remaining issues to be argued before the CARB :

1. The assessed rents are in excess of market value
2. The assessed GIM is in excess of market value

**Complainant's Requested Value:**

**\$93,360,000\***

\* based on a reduction in the GIM applied to Beltline and Downtown properties from 13.0 to 12.19, along with an adjustment to the rent rates. The assessed typical vacancy and the assessment for the commercial portion were not contested.

**Exhibits Presented**

- C1 Complainant's evidence package
- R1 Respondent's evidence package

**Board's Findings in Respect of Each Matter or Issue:****1. Rent rate**

The Complainant proposed a revision to the rent rates based on recent lease signings in the subject shortly before the valuation date. The subject rent roll was provided, dated July 6, 2009 which gave ample and relevant evidence in support of the following rent rates: bachelor units at \$950, one bedroom units at \$1,015, two bedroom units at \$1,272 and three bedroom units at \$1,725 per month. Due to the size of the property and the large volume of Q1 and Q2 /2009 leases, this evidence was compelling.

The Respondent defended the assessed rent rate based on equity only with one other "Average Plus" and two "Good" high-rise rental buildings. There was no rent roll for the subject, nor any evidence regarding the derivation of the "typical" rent rates. The Assessor acknowledged that in comparison to the EGI per the rent roll, the assessed EGI is 3.6% high while the Complainant's requested EGI is about 5% low. Both are within an acceptable tolerance.

The Board accepted the Complainant's EGI request as the best evidence of market typical income for this property. The EGI derived from the rent roll includes all leases signed, including those dating back to mid-2008. The rent roll in fact shows evidence of considerably higher rents being attained in 2008. Therefore, the median of the 2009 lease signings for each of the suite types is most relevant. This formed the basis of the Complainant's EGI request.

**2. GIM**

The GIM of 13.0 was shown to be assessed uniformly to all Beltline high-rise properties. It is therefore equitable for similar properties with a similar location. A distinction is made for high-rise rental buildings in suburban locations, where a GIM of 11.5 is used. The Complainant's equity evidence regarding the GIM was limited to a table of suburban high-rises. This evidence was unconvincing to suggest that Downtown / Beltline properties would have an equivalent value to Suburban properties, all things being equal other than location. There is simply an insufficient database of sales to draw such a correlation with reasonable certainty.

Notwithstanding equity, the Complainant focused on a market GIM analysis, with a resulting request for a revised GIM of 12.19. This was based on an analysis of three Beltline high-rise buildings ranging in size from 33 to 84 suites. The three buildings are: Centennial House (930 15 Ave SW), Premier Place (1122 15 Ave SW) and Aldrin House (915 13 Ave SW). All were built in the 1970s. These three properties were the only sales of large rental apartment buildings that occurred within the year prior to the valuation date, and that were considered by the Assessment department to be 'valid' market sales.

The Respondent did however introduce a 2009 downtown west end sale of a 121 suite high-rise, referred to as the Sundial Apartments, located at 835 6 Ave SW. This occurred very close

to the valuation date on April 2, 2009 and indicated a GIM of 12.48 according to the City GIM study. The Respondent's contention was that this was however an inferior building, since it was purchased by the Calgary Drop-In & Rehab Centre Society with the intention of providing a mix of subsidized and market-priced units. The Board reviewed the Real Net sales report for this transaction, and could find no evidence to support the City's contention that the property could be considered in poor condition or in any way inferior. The evidence simply shows it to be a arm's length market sale.

The CARB notes that the Complainant's *Altus Downtown/Beltline GIM Study* has flaws in that an incorrect assumption was used regarding time-adjustment on sales prices along with an incorrect sale price for the Premier Place property. Referring to the GIM study presented by the Respondent, the CARB found that the Emerald Place property was an outlier and should not be given consideration as the sale price had evidently been negotiated approximately one year prior to the closing date at the peak of the market in 2007. Similarly, the Varsity Square property was also considered inappropriate given its suburban location. The sale involving Hillsboro Tower shows a 16.23 GIM according to the City analysis, which clearly does not fit with the other evidence. The Board notes that Hillsboro Tower has a large commercial component, which could skew the GIM if the commercial portion was undervalued. Accordingly the CARB is of the view that four properties should legitimately be incorporated into the 2010 Downtown/Beltline GIM Analysis, those being: Sundial Apartments, Centennial House, Premier Place and Aldrin House. After a thorough analysis of these four sales, the CARB finds insufficient evidence to conclusively warrant any significant adjustment to the assessed GIM.

### 3. Conclusion

The Complainant did not contest the commercial valuation of \$5,554,325. The CARB accepted the assessed GIM of 13.0. Applying this to the Complainant's requested EGI of \$7,203,740 results in a revised total of \$99,202,945 (truncated to \$99,200,000).

### Board's Decision:

The Board **reduced** the assessment to **\$99,200,000**. This alters the residential / non-residential ratio slightly to 94.40% residential and 5.60% non-residential.

DATED AT THE CITY OF CALGARY THIS 16<sup>th</sup> DAY OF December 2010.



C. J. GRIFFIN

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.*