



ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD

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

NOTICE OF DECISION NO. 0098 158/11

CVG
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 30, 2011, respecting a complaint for:

Roll Number	Municipal Address	Legal Description	Assessed Value	Assessment Type	Assessment Notice for:
2230720	13204 146 Street NW	Plan: 7621570 Block: 11 Lot: 4	\$1,238,000	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:

Tom Janzen, CVG

Persons Appearing on behalf of Respondent:

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

BACKGROUND

The subject property is a single tenant office/warehouse, located in the Bonaventure Industrial area at 13204 – 146 Street. The property consists of a total of 11,996 sq ft including 2,392 sq ft of office space as well as a 7,338 sq ft storage shed. The building was constructed in 1982. The lot size is 34,876 sq ft with a site coverage of 52%.

ISSUE(S)

What is the market value of the subject property at valuation date, July 1, 2010?

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 provided nine direct sales comparables, ranging in time adjusted sales price from \$70.18/sq ft to \$95.39/sq ft. The most similar comparables indicated were sales #1, 3, 4, 6, and 9. These values ranged from \$70.18/sq ft to \$78.36/ sq ft. The requested value is \$80.00/sq ft plus a \$150,000 allowance for the storage shed with a total requested assessed value of \$1,109,680.

The Complainant further argues that the storage shed should be considered when calculating the site coverage, as it does use the space within the land area of the parcel. The indicated site coverage including the shed is approximately 30%.

POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT

The Respondent advised that the assessment of the subject property was based on mass appraisal as legislated/regulated.

Further the Respondent submitted six direct sales comparables ranging from \$103.47/sq ft to \$152.65/sq ft.

The Respondent also provided ten equity comparables in support of the 2011 assessment. The equity comparables range in assessments from \$113.02 to \$176.89/sq ft with an average of \$119.77/sq ft.

DECISION

The decision of the Board is to confirm the 2011 assessment at \$1,238,000.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The Board has determined that the direct sales comparables presented by the complainant are not similar to the subject for the following reasons:

- Sale #1 has access/egress problems due to site configuration
- Sale #3 was determined to be a non-arms length transaction
- Sale #4 was a multi parcel sale
-

The Board determined that the Complainant's comparables were not sufficiently supported in terms of similarity to the subject. The evidence to support the required adjustments was insufficient.

In regard to the site coverage, the Board is of the view that this structure appears to be a shelter which does not appear to hinder the overall use of the parcel.

DISSENTING OPINION AND REASONS

There were no dissenting decisions.

Dated this 7th 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: UNICO HOLDINGS INC