

# ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD

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

#### NOTICE OF DECISION NO. 0098 225/11

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 19, 2011, respecting a complaint for:

Roll	Municipal	Legal Description	Assessed	Assessment	Assessment
Number	Address		Value	Type	Notice for:
9988724	9333 - 41 Avenue NW	Plan: 0122453 Block: 16 Lot: 7A	\$4,043,500	Annual New	2011

#### **Before:**

Hatem Naboulsi, Presiding Officer Judy Shewchuk, Board Member Ron Funnell, Board Member

#### **Board Officer:**

Annet Adetunji

# Persons Appearing on behalf of Complainant:

Tom Janzen, Canadian Valuation Group

# Persons Appearing on behalf of Respondent:

Suzanne Magdiak, Assessor, City of Edmonton

### PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Upon questioning by the Presiding Officer, the parties present indicated no objection to the composition of the Board. In addition, the Board members indicated no bias with respect to this file.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The subject property is a single-tenant office/warehouse building located in the Strathcona Industrial Park neighborhood. The property was built in 2000 and contains a total of 21,850 square feet on a 127,893.501 square foot (2.936 acre) lot for a site coverage of 17%. The 2011 assessment of the property is \$4,043,500 which equates to \$185.06 per square foot.

#### **ISSUE**

Is the 2011 assessment of the subject property at \$4,043,500 fair and equitable?

# **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 presented eight sales and assessment comparables ranging in time adjusted sale price from \$104.96 to \$189.72 per square foot. The assessments of these comparables ranged from \$95.95 to \$187.19 per square foot. The range of building sizes was 10,062 to 23,650 square feet and the range of site coverages was 17% to 44%. The Complainant asked that the assessment of the subject property be reduced to \$160.00 per square foot for a total of \$3,496,000.

The Complainant also presented rebuttal evidence which listed the assessments of the Respondent's six sales comparables ranging from \$99.56 to \$204.37 per square foot. As the assessments were consistently lower than the adjusted sale prices, the Complainant argued that this supports a reduction in the assessment of the subject.

# **POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT**

The Respondent presented six sales comparables, all located in the southeast quadrant, ranging in time adjusted sale prices from \$167.53 to \$236.02 per square foot. The building sizes ranged from 5,400 to 15,001 square feet and the site coverages ranged from 17% to 48%.

Seven equity comparables with assessments ranging from \$183.40 to \$216.15 per square foot were also presented to support the assessment of the subject.

# **DECISION**

The decision of the Board is to reduce the 2011 assessment from \$4,043,500 to \$3,728,000.

#### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

The Board was presented with a wide range of sales and assessment comparables from both parties. The locations of all these comparables were in the southeast quadrant, as is the subject; however they were spread across a rather large area nonetheless. The site coverages ranged from 17% to 48% and the building sizes ranged from 5,400 to 23,650 square feet. Even the ages of the buildings ranged from year built 1980 to 2001.

The Board relied on the site coverages of the Complainant's sales and assessment comparables #1 and #6 with site coverages of 17% and 18% respectively and on the Respondent's sales and assessment comparables #3 and #5 with site coverages of 17% and 20% respectively. The average of the assessments for these four properties was \$170.62 per square foot. Accordingly, in the interest of fairness and equity, the Board reduces the 2011 assessment of the subject to \$170.62 per square foot for a total of \$3,728,000.

# **DISSENTING OPINION AND REASONS**

There was no dissenting opinion.

Dated this 7<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2011, at the City of Edmonton, in the Province of Alberta.

Hatem Naboulsi, 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: Rice Investments Ltd