

**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:**

***Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada, COMPLAINANT (as represented by Altus Group Ltd)***

**and**

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

**before:**

***F.W. Wesseling, PRESIDING OFFICER  
A. Blake, MEMBER  
E. Reuther 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 2011 Assessment Roll as follows:

**ROLL NUMBER: 033044207**

**LOCATION ADDRESS: 1339 40 Ave NE**

**HEARING NUMBER: 62977**

**ASSESSMENT: \$6,590,000**

This complaint was heard on 14<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2011 at the office of the Assessment Review Board located at Floor Number 4, 1212 – 31 Avenue NE, Calgary, Alberta, Boardroom 2.

Appeared on behalf of the Complainant:

- *C. Van Staden -- Altus Group Ltd*

Appeared on behalf of the Respondent:

- *M. Berzins -- City of Calgary*

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

No specific jurisdictional or procedural matters were raised during the course of the hearing, and the CARB proceeded to hear the merits of the complaint

**Property Description:** Subject property is located in the McCall Industrial area in NE Calgary. The site contains two (2) warehouse buildings which were constructed in 2001 and have 52% and 96% finish respectively. The property contains 2.8 acres of land. The buildings are 27,000 and 14,000 square feet respectively and are assessed at \$127.00 and \$166.77 per square foot. Site coverage is 33.59 %. The site is classified "Industrial-General" in the City of Calgary Land Use Bylaw

**Issues:** The Complainant raised the following matter in Section 4 of the Assessment Complaint form: Assessment amount

Presentation of the Complainant and Respondent were limited to:

- Assessment market value is overstated in relation to comparable properties.
- Income Approach vs Sales Approach

**Complainant's Requested Value:** \$5,230,000.00

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

The presentation made by the parties as part of CARB 1340 2011-P with regard to the Industrial Capitalization Rate Analysis was carried forward and outlined below.

In support of its use of the income approach, the Complainant outlined the cap rate study which is intended to substantiate the requested assessments. As the Board's decision on the utility of the cap rate analysis is applicable to a number of referenced decisions, the analysis will be reviewed by the Board and carried forward in subsequent decisions.

The Board's review and conclusion of the cap rate analysis and the City's response to it is that the Complainant's data (sample size of sales) supporting the analysis was too limited, and

mixed typical and actual inputs. As such it did not generate the degree of confidence the Board would need in order to accept the cap rate analysis. In addition, the Board noted that rent roll information could not be provided in disclosure due to confidentiality concerns but that the City could examine the data at the Complainant's office. The Board found this to be problematic. The Board will have regard for the 2011 cap rate analysis as prepared by the Altus Group however it will determine its decision on each individual complaint based on the merits of the evidence submitted.

**Complainant's position:** The Complainant's requested assessment is based on the income approach. The data outlined to support this approach included a typical net market rents. Lease comparables were provided which indicated that the rates determined using City's assessment data of \$11.34 per square foot are unreasonable. It was indicated that typical leases in NE Calgary of similar size range have a median base rate rent of \$7.60. In addition a median business assessment rate per square foot calculation of \$7.60 was outlined. The income approach presented concluded that the property value should be \$ 110.00 per square foot instead of \$127.00 and \$168.00 per square foot respectively as determined by the City. No supporting information was provided through sales and equity comparables; however the subject property was sold in March of 2007 for \$11,950,000.00. With the appropriate adjustments, the complainant indicated the value of this property based on the 2007 sale should be \$5,412,525.00. Various CARB decisions from 2010 were included in the presentation for the Board's consideration.

**Respondent's Position:** The City's presentation focused on showing that the sales approach to value is most appropriate and acceptable method to derive market value. Seven (7)) sales were provided in support of the 2011 assessment which resulted in a median of \$173.00 per square foot for the smaller building while for the larger building the median reported was \$128.00 per square foot.. The multi building co-efficient was outlined and how it was derived based on 2010 CARB decisions. The multi-building adjustment (downward) was applied in arriving at the assessment for the subject property. The 2007 sale of the property was considered dated by the Respondent. With regard to the income approach, the City indicated that it could not recreate the data analysis as completed by the Altus Group. The City did an assessment to sales ratio (ASR) test of the Complainant's data which produced an unacceptable ratio of 0.78, total median value.

The decision with regard to CARB 0859 2011-P was pointed to for the Board's consideration as a recent ruling on a similar complaint.

**Board's Decision:** Upon reviewing the verbal and written evidence provided by the parties, the Board found that the Respondent's evidence most relevant and compelling and that the Complainant's requested assessment was not supported by the data presented.

**Reasons:** The Board determined that the sales approach as presented by the respondent was based on a good sample size and included the appropriate time adjustments. The Complainant's position is largely based on the cap rate analysis which as stated above, the Board considers flawed. Site specific evidence does not support a reduction in assessment. The City did apply the multi-building adjustment which influenced the assessment downward. The 2007 sale of the property is no longer considered relevant in the current market place. Having regard to Section 467 (3) of the Municipal Government Act, the Board found no alteration to the assessment was warranted.

The Board confirms the assessment at \$6,590,000.00.

DATED AT THE CITY OF CALGARY THIS 5 DAY OF August 2011.



**F.W. Wesseling**  
**Presiding Officer**

**APPENDIX "A"**

**DOCUMENTS PRESENTED AT THE HEARING  
AND CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD:**

Complainant: C1 Evidence Submission of the Complainant to the 2011 ARB  
C2 Industrial Capitalization Rate Analysis 2011 Assessment Year  
Respondent: R1 Assessment Brief prepared by City of Calgary Assessment

*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.*