



ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD

Churchill Building
10019 103 Avenue
Edmonton AB T5J 0G9
Phone: (780) 496-5026

NOTICE OF DECISION NO. 0098 135/11

John C. Manning
c/o 1200, 10665 Jasper Avenue
Edmonton, AB T5J 3S9

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 August 29, 2011, respecting a complaint for:

Roll Number	Municipal Address	Legal Description	Assessed Value	Assessment Type	Assessment Notice for:
2219780	14605 128 Avenue NW	Plan: 2119NY Block: 1 Lot: 15, 16	\$5,905,500	Annual New	2011

Before:

Tom Robert, Presiding Officer
Petra Hagemann, Board Member
Tom Eapen, Board Member

Board Officer: Jason Morris

Persons Appearing on behalf of Complainant:

Peter Smith, CVG

Persons Appearing on behalf of Respondent:

Luis Delgado, City of Edmonton, Assessor
Stephen Leroux, City of Edmonton, Assessor

BACKGROUND

The subject warehouse/office complex is located in the Bonaventure Industrial area at 14605 – 128 Ave, NW. The property consists of 2 buildings, a total building area of 96,038 sq ft (380 sq ft of finished mezzanine and 8,187 sq ft of office) situated on 205,597.4 sq ft of land for a site coverage of 47%, and is a single tenant building.

ISSUE(S)

What is the market value of the subject property as of the assessment date of July 1, 2011?

LEGISLATION

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

The Complainant put forward eight direct sales comparables ranging in value per sq ft from \$52.40 to \$70.04. The indicated best comparables were sales #2,3,5, 6 and 7. The value of these comparables range from \$52.40/sq ft to \$68.16/sq ft. The Complainant put most weight to these comparables indicating a requested value of \$55.00/sq ft or a total value of \$5,282,000.

POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT

The Respondent argues that the subject property is valued on the basis of mass appraisal as legislated [Matters Relating to Assessment and Taxation Regulation – Part I – Standards of Assessment – Mass appraisal (2) (a) (b) (c), valuation date (3)].

Further the Respondent put forward nine direct sales comparables ranging in value from \$57.92 to \$101.65. The Respondent suggested that the comparable sales put forward indicate that none of these direct sales fall much below the \$60.00/sq ft value, which would represent the bottom of industrial warehouses within the area of the subject. The closest comparable with similar characteristic to the subject is at approximately \$68.93/sq ft (sale #8).

In support of the Direct Sales Comparables, the Respondent also presented an equity chart of comparables indicating assessment values ranging from \$63.52/sq ft to \$77.19/sq ft, all similar in age, condition, location, site coverage and size.

The Respondent provided a chart of the Complainant's valid sales (within the valuation date) indicating values from \$57.92/sq ft to \$78.13/sq ft which would confirm the assessment.

DECISION

The decision of the Board is to confirm the 2011 assessment at \$5,905,500.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The Board determined that the direct sales comparables as presented by the Complainant required unsupportable adjustments as to size, year, space allocation and location. The indicated best comparables presented by both parties show a value range of approximately \$58.00/sq ft to \$72.00/sq ft. The 2011 assessment per sq ft is \$61.89. The range as indicated appears to support the assessment.

DISSENTING OPINION AND REASONS

There were no dissenting opinions.

Dated this 6th day of September, 2011, at the City of Edmonton, in the Province of Alberta.

Tom Robert, Presiding Officer

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: CVG
SREIT (WEST NO 3) LTD