



ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD

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

NOTICE OF DECISION NO. 0098 254/11

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 October 19, 2011, respecting a complaint for:

Roll Number	Municipal Address	Legal Description	Assessed Value	Assessment Type	Assessment Notice for:
3191558	10920 178 Street NW	Plan: 8722527 Lot: 1	\$8,494,000	Annual New	2011

Before:

Patricia Mowbrey, Presiding Officer
Jack Jones, Board Member
Jasbeer Singh, Board Member

Board Officer: Jason Morris

Persons Appearing on behalf of Complainant:

Tom Janzen, CVG

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 an owner-occupied industrial office/warehouse building located at 10920 – 178 Street in the Wilson Industrial neighbourhood of northwest Edmonton. It is a single building of approximately 142,600 square feet on a lot of approximately 241,500 square feet with a site coverage of 55%. It was assessed on a direct sales comparison basis for a 2011 assessment of \$8,494,000.

ISSUE(S)

Is the 2011 assessment of the subject property at \$8,494,000 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 evidence (C-1) and argument for the Board's review and consideration.

The Complainant presented seven time adjusted sales comparables (C-1, page 1) to support a requested reduction of the 2011 assessment from \$59.58 to \$50.00 per square foot. The Complainant indicated that the most weight should be placed on sales comparables #2, 3, 4, 5 & 6, as these properties had the most physical characteristics in common with the subject property.

The Complainant requested the 2011 assessment be reduced from \$8,494,000 to \$7,129,000 (C-1, page 2).

POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT

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

The Respondent outlined the mass appraisal process and the factors found to influence value in the warehouse market (R-1, page 7).

The Respondent presented seven time adjusted sales comparables (R-1, page 21) to support the 2011 assessment of \$59.58 per square foot. The Respondent indicated that the most weight should be placed on sales comparables #1, 2, 4 & 7 as these properties had the most physical characteristics in common with the subject property.

The Respondent also presented eleven equity comparables (R-1, page 29) to support the 2011 assessment of the subject property.

The Respondent presented evidence (R-1, pages 30, 31 & 32) which questioned the validity of the Complainant's sales comparables # 5, 6 & 2.

The Respondent requested the 2011 assessment be confirmed at \$8,494,000.

DECISION

The decision of the Board is to confirm the 2011 assessment of the subject property at \$8,494,000 as fair and equitable.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

- 1) The Board considered the evidence and argument presented by both parties.
- 2) The Complainant's comparable #1, built in 1978 with a substantial upper floor component has a time adjusted sales price of \$69.85 per square foot whereas the subject is located on a major traffic artery and is assessed at \$59.58 per square foot.
- 3) The Board considered the Complainant's sales comparable #7 which is 22 years older than the subject property and has a time adjusted sales price of \$61.67 per square foot. This supports the subject property's assessment of \$59.58, even considering the building size differential which is 1/3 the size of the subject property.
- 4) The Complainant identified five sales comparables (C-1, page 1), #2, 3, 4, 5 & 6, as the most similar to the subject property. The average sale price of these comparables is \$56.77 per square foot which supports the 2011 assessment at \$59.58 per square foot.
- 5) The Board noted that the Complainant's sale comparable #3 (C-1, page 1) and the Respondent's sale comparable #4 (R-1, page 21) are the same and is of similar size and age to the subject property. The Board is of the opinion that this is the best comparable to the subject property and has a time adjusted sale price of \$68.16 per square foot which supports the subject property's assessment of \$59.58 per square foot.
- 6) The Board found that the Respondent's equity comparables (R-1, page 29) further supported the 2011 assessment of the subject property.

- 7) The Board finds that the 2011 assessment of the subject property at \$8,494,000 is fair and equitable.

DISSENTING OPINION AND REASONS

There were no dissenting opinions.

Dated this 19th day of October, 2011, at the City of Edmonton, in the Province of Alberta.

Patricia Mowbrey, 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: 803865 ALBERTA LTD