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:

Safeway Holdings (Alberta) LTD. (as represented by MNP LLP), COMPLAINANT

and

The City Of Calgary, RESPONDENT

before:

Tom Golden, PRESIDING OFFICER B Jerchel, MEMBER J Lam, 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:

ROLL NUMBER:

032033300

LOCATION ADDRESS: 4321 23B ST NE

FILE NUMBER:

66519

ASSESSMENT:

\$2,600,000.00

This complaint was heard on 31 day of July, 2012 at the office of the Assessment Review Board located at Floor Number 4 1212 – 31 Avenue NE, Calgary, Alberta, Boardroom 5.

Appeared on behalf of the Complainant:

M. Uhryn

Appeared on behalf of the Respondent:

K Gardiner
L. Cheng

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

[1] There were no procedural issue to consider.

Property Description:

[2] The subject property built in 1983 is a multi tenanted warehouse. It has a footprint of 14,309 square feet (sq ft) and an assessable area of 21,679 sq ft on 1.05 acres. The assessment was determined using the direct sales approach, at \$120.00 per sq ft.

Issues:

[3] Is the subject property equitably assessed when compared to the sales of similar properties?

Complainant's Requested Value: \$2,428,000.00

Board's Decision in Respect of the Equity issue:

- [4] The property is equitably assessed.
- [5] The Complainant presented the Board with 5 sales. These properties sold between \$81.00 per sq ft and \$123.00 per sq ft. The median value was \$112.00 per sq ft which, is the basis of the requested value.
- [5] The Respondent questioned the applicability of the Complainants sales comparables pointing to the fact that all have older buildings with higher site coverage. Two of the sales are also from out of the area. The Respondent presented their table of equity comparables to support the assessment.
- [6] The Board focused on the comparables of the Complainant and gave them little weight. Of the 5 sale shown 2 were not in the NE and the other three were significantly older than the subject. Given this the best evidence of the assessment is the Respondents equity comparables, that support the assessment.

Board's Decision:

[7] The assessment is confirmed at \$2,600,000.00.

Presiding Officer

APPENDIX "A"

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED AT THE HEARING AND CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD:

NO.	ITEM		
1. C1	Complainant Disclosure		
2. R2	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.

		Property Sub-		
Appeal Type	Property Type	Туре	Issue	Sub-Issue
CARB	Industrial	warehouse	Sales Approach	Vacancy