

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 400/10

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	Municipal Address	Legal Description
8638363	8605 63 Avenue NW	Plan: 6445MC Block: 4 Lot: 5
Assessed Value	Assessment Type	Assessment Notice for:
\$3,058,500	Annual – New	2010

Before:

Board Officer:

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

Persons Appearing: Complainant

Walid Melhem

Persons Appearing: Respondent

Joel Schmaus, 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 1964 and located in the Coronet Addition Industrial subdivision of the City of Edmonton. The property has a building area of 26,077 square feet with site coverage of 28%.

ISSUES

The Complainant had attached a schedule listing numerous issues to the complaint form. However, most of those issues were abandoned and only the following issues remained for the Board to decide:

- What is the typical market value of the subject property?
- Is the assessment of the subject property fair and equitable in comparison with similar properties?

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 sales comparables ranging in value from \$32.91 to \$180.45 per sq. ft. The average total floor value of these comparables was \$84.24 while average main floor

value was \$93.71 per sq. ft. Comparable # 2 with comparable lot size and site coverage was considered to be the best comparable at \$86.91 per sq. ft.

The Complainant also submitted six equity comparables ranging in value from \$86.39 to \$116.19 per sq. ft. with an average total floor assessment value of \$100.52 per sq. ft. These comparables had an average main floor only value of \$116.25 per sq. ft.

The Complainant requested a reduction of the assessment to \$2,621,000 based on the average total floor value of the equity comparables provided.

POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT

The Respondent provided seven sales comparables ranging in value from \$110.24 to \$145.69 per sq. ft. in support of the assessed value of \$117.29 per sq. ft.

The Respondent also provided seven equity comparables of which # 5, # 6 and # 7 were considered to be the best indicators of value. These comparables somewhat newer in age, but with similar site coverage, square footage and lot size were assessed at \$129.50, \$119.72 and \$132.99 per sq. ft. respectively.

DECISION

The decision of the Board is to confirm the assessment at \$3,058,500.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The Board is of the opinion that the Complainant's average assessment value of \$116.25 per sq. ft. for main floor only space supports the assessment of the subject at \$117.29 per sq. ft.

The assessment is further supported by the range of the equity comparables provided by the Respondent indicating that the assessment falls to the lower end of the range.

DISSENTING OPINION AND REASONS

There was no dissenting opinion.

Dated this 25th 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 Leah Superstein