

**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, Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000 (the Act).

**between:**

***Theatre Poster Exch Ltd as represented by (Assessment Advisory Group Inc),  
COMPLAINANT***

**and**

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

**before:**

***B. Horrocks, PRESIDING OFFICER  
S. Rourke, MEMBER  
J. Rankin, MEMBER***

This is a complaint to the Calgary Assessment Review Board in respect of a property assessment prepared by the Assessor of The City of Calgary and entered in the 2012 Assessment Roll as follows:

<b>ROLL NUMBER:</b>	<b>032028409</b>
<b>LOCATION ADDRESS:</b>	<b>2025 41 AV NE</b>
<b>HEARING NUMBER:</b>	<b>67202</b>
<b>ASSESSMENT:</b>	<b>\$2,230,000</b>

This complaint was heard on the 4th day of July, 2012 at the office of the Assessment Review Board located at Floor Number 3, 1212 – 31 Avenue NE, Calgary, Alberta, Boardroom 9.

Appeared on behalf of the Complainant:

- Mr. S. Cobb (Assessment Advisory Group Inc)
- Mr. T. Youn (Assessment Advisory Group Inc)

Appeared on behalf of the Respondent:

- Mr. J. Greer (City of Calgary)

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

[1] There were no concerns with the Board as constituted.

[2] There were no preliminary matters. The merit hearing proceeded.

**Property Description:**

[3] The subject property is a 1.25 acre parcel located in the North Airways Industrial Park in NE Calgary. The site is improved with a 21,219 square foot (SF) single bay warehouse that was constructed in 1976. The Finish is 30%, the Site Coverage is 39.03% and the Assessable Building Area is 21,137 SF. The subject is assessed at the rate of \$105.85/SF utilizing the Sales Comparison approach to value.

**Issues:**

[4] The Assessment Review Board Complaint Form contained 2 Grounds for Complaint, namely: "The assessed value is not reflective of the property's market value" and "The assessed value is inequitable with comparable property assessments".

**Complainant's Requested Value:** \$1,902,330 (Complaint Form)  
\$1,873,200 (Hearing)

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

**Issue** What is the correct Building Type?

[5] The Complainant's Disclosure is labelled C-1.

[6] The Complainant submitted the subject is a class C industrial warehouse with two tenants, occupying 8757 SF and 12390 SF respectively, operating as separate entities. Further, industrial warehouse sales data from RealNet shows the difference in the average sale price per square foot between single tenant and multi-tenant properties is 16%, with the single tenant properties selling for the higher price.

[7] The Respondent, referred to page 5 of C-1, noting the comments immediately below the table clearly state: IWS= Industrial warehouse 2 or less units  
IWM = Industrial warehouse 3 or more units. The Respondent submitted the assessment is concerned with the structure of the building, as per the evaluation date, and has nothing to do with the number of tenants.

[8] The Board finds the subject is IWS as shown on the 2012 Industrial Assessment Explanation Supplement because there are only two (2) units.

**Issue** What is the market value for assessment purposes?

[9] The Complainant, at page 24, submitted an untitled chart from RealNet which identified industrial sales from throughout Calgary, in the 15,000 to 30,000 SF range which had occurred between August 10, 2009 and June 28, 2011. The Complainant submitted the properties were all IWS and the sale prices ranged from \$77 to \$212/SF with an average of \$135/SF.

[10] The Complainant, at page 25, produced a similar chart for all IWM properties, noting the sale prices ranged from \$71 to \$149/SF with an average of \$116/SF. The Complainant calculated the difference in the average sale price between IWS and IWM to be 16% and requested the assessed value be reduced to \$1,873,200 which represents the current assessment less 16%.

[11] The Respondent's Disclosure is labelled R-1.

[12] The Respondent, on page 12, provided a chart titled 2012 Industrial Sales Chart (Northeast sales of warehouses between 15,000 and 25,000 SF). The chart contained 8 sales comparables with time adjusted sale prices per square foot (TASP/SF) ranging from \$110.28 to \$180.53 with a median of \$139.30/SF. The Respondent noted the two most comparable sales were located at 2801 18 ST NE and 2610 3 AV NE with TASP/SF of \$110.28 and \$118.01, noting the subject is assessed at \$105.85/SF.

[13] The Board finds the sales comparables submitted by both parties support the assessment.

**Board's Decision:**

[14] The 2012 assessment is confirmed at \$2,230,000.

**Reasons:**

[15] The Complainant's Building Type classification/equity argument failed.

[16] The sales comparables from both parties support the assessment.

DATED AT THE CITY OF CALGARY THIS 2 DAY OF AUGUST 2012.

  
B. Horrocks  
Presiding Officer

**APPENDIX "A"****DOCUMENTS PRESENTED AT THE HEARING  
AND CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD:**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>ITEM</b>
1. C1	Complainant Disclosure
2. R1	Respondent Disclosure

*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.*

**For Administrative Use**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Property type</b>	<b>Property Sub-type</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Sub-issue</b>
CARB	Warehouse	Single bay	Sales Approach	Market value