



ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD

MAIN FLOOR CITY HALL
1 SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL SQUARE
EDMONTON AB T5J 2R7
(780) 496-5026 FAX (780) 496-8199

NOTICE OF DECISION NO. 0098 373/10

Altus Group Ltd
17327 - 106A Avenue
Edmonton AB T5S 1M7

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 between August 23 and October 21, 2010 respecting a complaint for:

Roll Number 1077510	Municipal Address 11821 Meridian Street NE	Legal Description Plan: 3813MC Lot: B
Assessed Value \$4,112,000	Assessment Type Annual – New	Assessment Notice for: 2010

Before:

Tom Robert, Presiding Officer
Dale Doan, Board Member
Mary Sheldon, Board Member

Board Officer:

Segun Kaffo

Persons Appearing: Complainant

Walid Melhem

Persons Appearing: Respondent

Mary-Alice Lesyk, Assessor
Steve Lutes, Law Branch

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

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

All parties giving evidence during the proceedings were sworn by the Board Officer.

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

The parties agreed that all evidence, submissions and argument on Roll # 8480097 would be carried forward to this file to the extent that matters were relevant to this file. In particular, the Complainant chose not to pursue arguments with respect to the evidence he had provided regarding the income approach to value.

The Complainant and the Respondent presented to the Board differing time adjustment figures for industrial warehouses based on the Complainant's submission that some data used in the preparation of the Respondent's time adjustment model was faulty. The Board reviewed the data from the Complainant used in the preparation of his time adjustment figures and was of the opinion that the data used was somewhat questionable (Exhibit C-2). In any event, the differences between the time adjustment charts used by the parties for industrial warehouses were small and in many cases of little significance. Therefore, the Board has accepted the time adjustment figures used by the Respondent.

BACKGROUND

The subject property is a medium warehouse built in 1968 and located in the Clover Bar Area subdivision of the City of Edmonton. The property has a total building area of 38,912 square feet with site coverage of 20%.

ISSUES

The Complainant had attached a schedule listing numerous issues to the complaint form. However, most of those issues had been abandoned and the issue left to be decided was as follows:

- What is the typical market value of the subject property?

LEGISLATION

The Municipal Government Act, R.S.A. 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 four direct sales comparables ranging in value from \$63.68 to \$74.09 per sq. ft. indicating total floor space average of \$68.96 per sq. ft., and \$72.54 per sq. ft. on main floor space only.

The Complainant argued that the comparable sales, although not in the same area of the subject, are similar in that they like the subject have an access problem.

POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT

The Respondent presented two groupings of sales comparables. Firstly, sales # 1 to # 7 were comparables chosen in similar neighbourhood with values ranging from \$94.09 to \$225.13 per sq. ft. Secondly, sales comparables # 8 to # 12 ranging in value from \$110.24 to \$141.08 per sq. ft. were chosen for other similar characteristics.

The Respondent further presented five equity comparables ranging in value from \$98 to \$131 per sq. ft. to support the assessment.

DECISION

The decision of the Board is to confirm the assessment at \$4,112,000.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The Board is of the opinion that the evidence presented did not support an adjustment in regard to access. Although the Complainant put forward four comparables, all were newer than the subject. Further, no evidence was presented as to the similarity in regard to the issue of limited access.

In review of the sales and equity comparables presented by both parties, the Board is of the opinion that no substantive comparable evidence was put forward, and therefore the assessment is confirmed.

DISSENTING OPINION AND REASONS

There was no dissenting opinion.

Dated this 26th day of October, 2010, at the City of Edmonton, in the Province of Alberta.

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, R.S.A. 2000, c.M-26.

CC: Municipal Government Board
Great Western Containers Inc.