

**NOTICE OF DECISION      NO. 0098 110/12**

Altus Group  
780-10180 101 Street NW  
Edmonton, AB T5J 3S4

The City of Edmonton  
Assessment and Taxation Branch  
600 Chancery Hall  
3 Sir Winston Churchill Square  
Edmonton AB T5J 2C3

This is a decision of the Composite Assessment Review Board (CARB) from a hearing held on July 16, 2012, respecting a complaint for:

<b>Roll Number</b>	<b>Municipal Address</b>	<b>Legal Description</b>	<b>Assessed Value</b>	<b>Assessment Type</b>	<b>Assessment Notice for:</b>
3082443	10630 176 Street NW	Plan: 8020508 Block: 4 Lot: 2A / Plan: 8020508 Block: 4 Lot: 1A	\$5,791,500	Annual New	2012

*This decision may be appealed to the Court of Queen's Bench on a question of law or jurisdiction, pursuant to Section 470(1) of the Municipal Government Act, RSA 2000, c M-26.*

---

cc:    BRANDT TRACTOR PROPERTIES LTD

## **Edmonton Composite Assessment Review Board**

**Citation: Altus Group v The City of Edmonton, 2012 ECARB 000961**

**Assessment Roll Number:** 3082443  
**Municipal Address:** 10630 176 Street NW  
**Assessment Year:** 2012  
**Assessment Type:** Annual New

Between:

**Altus Group**

Complainant

and

**The City of Edmonton, Assessment and Taxation Branch**

Respondent

---

**DECISION OF**  
**John Noonan, Presiding Officer**  
**Jack Jones, Board Member**  
**Pam Gill, Board Member**

---

### **Background**

[1] The subject property is in average condition, industrial warehouse, built in 1983 and is located in the McNamara Industrial neighborhood. It has 44,164 square feet of main floor area of which 12,231 square feet is office space. The subject property has site coverage of 19% and has been assessed for 2012 utilizing the direct sales comparison approach to valuation based on sales occurring between January 2008 and June 2011. The subject property has also been assessed with the attribute of being located on a major roadway.

### **Issue**

[2] The complaint form listed fourteen issues for complaint, however at the hearing the Complainant only presented evidence and argument on the following issue:

- 1) Is the 2012 assessment of the subject property at \$5,791,500 fair?

### **Legislation**

[3] The *Municipal Government Act* reads:

***Municipal Government Act, RSA 2000, c M-26***

s 467(1) An assessment review board may, with respect to any matter referred to in section 460(5), make a change to an assessment roll or tax roll or decide that no change is required.

s 467(3) An assessment review board must not alter any assessment that is fair and equitable, taking into consideration

- a) the valuation and other standards set out in the regulations,
- b) the procedures set out in the regulations, and
- c) the assessments of similar property or businesses in the same municipality.

### **Position Of The Complainant**

[4] The Complainant presented evidence (C-1) and argument for the Board's review and consideration.

[5] The Complainant presented four sales comparables (C-1, page 8) in support of a requested reduction of the 2012 assessment of the subject property. The Complainant advised that the sales comparables had been time adjusted to the valuation date of July 1, 2011 utilizing the same factors used by the Respondent (C-1, pages 15 & 16). The comparables presented ranged in value from \$47.88 to \$176.59 per square foot compared to the assessed value of \$131.13 per square foot. Utilizing the median value of these comparables as a guideline, the Complainant indicated that an appropriate unit valuation for the subject property would be \$90.00 per square foot for a total valuation of \$3,974,500.

[6] In summary the Complainant requested the 2012 assessment of the subject property be reduced from \$5,791,500 to \$3,974,500.

### **Position Of The Respondent**

[7] The Respondent presented evidence (R-1 & R-2) and argument for the Board's review and consideration.

[8] The Respondent presented five sales comparables (R-1, page 10) in support of the 2012 assessment of the subject property. The comparables presented ranged in value from \$111.02 to \$208.40 per square foot compared to the assessed value of \$131.33 per square foot.

[9] The Respondent noted that properties located on major roadways were typically assessed at a value approximately 10% higher than properties that did not have this attribute. The Respondent also stressed the importance of considering all factors in the valuation process (R-1, page 28 & 29) which include: age, location, lot size, area, finished area, condition and site coverage.

[10] In summary the Respondent requested the 2012 assessment of the subject property be confirmed at \$5,791,500.

### **Decision**

[11] The Board reduces the 2012 assessment of the subject property from \$5,791,500 to \$5,079,000.

## **Reasons For The Decision**

[12] After review and consideration of the evidence and argument presented by both parties the Board determined the 2012 assessment of the subject property at \$5,791,500 overstated its market value in view of the best available sales evidence.

[13] The Board places greatest weight on sales comparable #3 presented by the Complainant (C-1, page 8) and sales comparable #3 presented by the Respondent (R-1, page 10). The Board finds these two sales comparables to be the most similar to the subject property with respect to age, condition, lot size, building area and site coverage. These comparables support a reduction to the 2012 assessment of the subject property from \$131.13 to the average of the two sales comparables (112.62 and 117.43) at \$115.00 per square foot.

[14] The Board applies a revised unit value of \$115.00 to the subject building area of 44,164 square feet to arrive at a revised 2012 assessment of \$5,079,000.

[15] The Board finds that the revised 2012 assessment of the subject property at \$5,079,000 is fair.

Heard July 16, 2012.

Dated this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of August, 2012, at the City of Edmonton, Alberta.

---

Pam Gill, Board Member

### **Appearances:**

Walid Melhem, Altus Group  
for the Complainant

Suzanne Magdiak, City of Edmonton  
for the Respondent