



ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD

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

NOTICE OF DECISION NO. 0098 200/11

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 September 7, 2011, respecting a complaint for:

Roll Number	Municipal Address	Legal Description	Assessed Value	Assessment Type	Assessment Notice for:
8620700	9924 - 63 AVENUE NW	Plan: 4460HW Block: 33 Lot: 2	\$1,116,000	Annual New	2011

Before:

John Noonan, Presiding Officer
Judy Shewchuk, Board Member
Ron Funnell, Board Member

Board Officer: Jason Morris

Persons Appearing on behalf of Complainant:

Tom Janzen, CVG

Persons Appearing on behalf of Respondent:

Susen Douglass, Assessor, City of Edmonton

BACKGROUND

The subject is a single tenant 4,063 sq.ft. office/warehouse built in 1955 and situated on a 1.5 acre lot for a site coverage of 6%. There is no office space in the building. The 2011 assessment was prepared by the direct sales comparison approach, and equates to a per sq.ft. value of \$274.67 for the improvement.

ISSUE(S)

The complaint form identified a number of issues: that the assessment was greater than the July 1, 2010 market value and inequitable in relation to assessments of similar properties; the capitalized value of the actual net operating income is less than the assessment; the property details and description do not correctly reflect actual physical characteristics; an analysis of ASRs (assessment to sales ratios) of similar properties supported a lower assessment value.

At the hearing, evidence and argument from the Complainant addressed a single issue:

1. Do the Complainant's sales comparables justify a lower assessment?

In addition to market sales evidence, the Respondent also addressed assessment equity.

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 requested the assessment be reduced to \$812,600. The request was based on an analysis and comparison of 4 sales that concluded an appropriate per sq.ft. value for the subject of \$200 as opposed to the assessed value of \$274.67.

The 4 sales occurred between September 2007 and July 2008, were time-adjusted by the same factors employed by the Respondent, and showed per sq.ft. values ranging from \$176.64 to \$304.66.

POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT

The Respondent presented 8 sales comparables dated from February 2007 to May 2010. The sales showed an average adjusted sale price per sq.ft. of main floor area and total building area of \$259.91 and \$230.98 as compared to the subject's assessed value of \$274.67.

A list of 17 equity comparables selected for similar age, south side location, and building and lot sizes showed assessments per sq.ft. of main floor building area in a range from \$208.31 to \$301.26 and assessment of total building area in a range from \$173.50 to \$301.26.

DECISION

The CARB confirms the 2011 assessment at \$1,116,000.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The best evidence before the Board was a sale presented by the Respondent at 5905 – 97 Street, an August 2007 sale some 3 years prior to valuation. That property was just over 1 acre in size and, like the subject, had an older 4,000 sq.ft. building. That property sold for \$1,300,000 or \$1,421,030 time adjusted. The Board decided that this transaction was the best indicator of the subject's value and, as the assessment is substantially lower, the CARB declines to alter the assessment.

Dated this 29th day of September, 2011, at the City of Edmonton, in the Province of Alberta.

John Noonan, 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: SENTINEL SELF-STORAGE CORPORATION