



ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD

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

NOTICE OF DECISION NO. 0098 318/11

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 26, 2011, respecting a complaint for:

Roll Number	Municipal Address	Legal Description	Assessed Value	Assessment Type	Assessment Notice for:
8950388	2910 Parsons Road NW	Plan: 7620155 Block: 1 Lot: 11	\$1,912,500	Annual New	2011

Before:

Tom Robert, Presiding Officer
Jack Jones, Board Member
John Braim, Board Member

Board Officer: Segun Kaffo

Persons Appearing on behalf of Complainant:

Tom Janzen

Persons Appearing on behalf of Respondent:

Susen Douglass

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

There were no preliminary matters relating to this file.

BACKGROUND

The subject property comprises a single-tenant office warehouse building located on a busy traffic artery containing a total of 10,011 square feet on one level with a site coverage ratio of 17%. The office component is 3,089 sq. ft. and the warehouse 6,922 sq. ft. It was built in 1976, has an effective age of 1980 and is in average condition. The assessment equates to a unit rate of \$191.04/ sq. ft.

ISSUE(S)

1. Is the assessment of the subject property higher than the market value?
2. Is the assessment equitable with similar properties?

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's disclosure included seven comparable sales located in the south-east industrial area that were time adjusted to valuation day (C-1, page 1). The age of the comparable buildings ranged from 1958 to 2001 and the sizes ranged from 8,000 sq. ft. to 15,085 sq. ft. The site coverage ratios ranged from 12% to 28% and the sale prices ranged from \$125.88/sq. ft. to \$187.18 sq. ft. The assessments of the same comparable sales range from \$120.77/ sq. ft. to \$185.28/ sq. ft.

POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT

In support of the assessment, the Respondent provided nine comparable sales (C-1, page 17) located in the south-east industrial district ranging in size from 5,846 sq. ft. to 25,479 sq. ft. Three of these comparables had finished mezzanine areas. The ages ranged from 1970 to 1993,

site coverage ratios ranged from 6% to 20% and the time adjusted sale prices ranged from \$173.46/ sq. ft. to \$259.59/ sq. ft. with an average of \$209.19/ sq. ft. or approximately \$202.00/ sq. ft. if the mezzanine areas are included.

The Complainant also provided a chart (C-1, page 18) detailing 11 equity comparables located in the south-east industrial district that ranged in age from 1964 to 1981, and in size from 5,006 sq. ft. to 11,692 sq. ft. two of which had finished mezzanine areas. They were all in average condition and had site coverage ratios ranging from 10% to 17%. The assessments ranged from \$186.46/ sq. ft. to \$199.43/ sq. ft. with an average of 191.60/ sq. ft.

DECISION

After considering all the evidence and argument of the respective parties the decision of the Board is to confirm the 2011 assessment of \$1,912,500.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

1. The Board was persuaded by the evidence and argument of the Respondent that included sales comparables and equity comparables. Only two sales comparables were located on busier traffic arteries and no upward location adjustment had been made to the other comparables that were not on busier traffic arteries. The subject assessment falls within the range of the comparables and the average unit rate indicates the assessment is very close to market value.
2. The Board was also persuaded by the Respondent's equity chart that included the subject property and two equity comparables that were also on busier traffic arteries. Again no upward adjustment was made for location to the comparables that were not on busier traffic arteries. The assessment of the subject property was located close to the middle of the range of comparables, and was also very closely supported by the average of these assessment comparables.
3. The Board placed less weight on the Complainant's comparables, as none of them were located on busier traffic arteries, and no upward adjustment was made to either the sales or assessments to make them comparable to the location of the subject property.

Dated this 9th day of November, 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: 1064195 Alberta Ltd