



## ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD

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

### NOTICE OF DECISION NO. 0098 403/11

Altus Group  
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 on November 14, 2011, respecting a complaint for:

| Roll Number | Municipal Address   | Legal Description                 | Assessed Value | Assessment Type | Assessment Notice for: |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| 9980552     | 14545 118 Avenue NW | Plan: 0022266<br>Block: 8 Lot: 8B | \$3,158,000    | Annual New      | 2011                   |

#### Before:

Robert Mowbrey, Presiding Officer  
Dale Doan, Board Member  
Lillian Lundgren, Board Member

#### Board Officer:

Annet Adetunji

#### Persons Appearing on behalf of Complainant:

Chris Buchanan, Altus Group Ltd

#### Persons Appearing on behalf of Respondent:

Stephen Leroux, Assessor, City of Edmonton  
Suzanne Magdiak, Assessor, City of Edmonton

## **PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

Upon questioning by the Presiding Officer, the parties indicated no objection to the composition of the Board. In addition, the Board advised the parties that the Board had no bias on this file.

## **BACKGROUND**

The subject property is a medium warehouse located at 14545 118 Avenue NW in the Huff Bremner Estate Industrial neighborhood. The 72,013 square foot site is improved with a warehouse that has an effective year built of 1972 and a total building area of 35,642sf. The site coverage is 47%.

## **ISSUE:**

1. Is the subject property assessment correct 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 filed this complaint on the basis that the subject assessment is incorrect and inequitable. The Complainant argued that recent market transactions indicate that the property value should be \$2,976,000. The median sale price per square foot needs to be adjusted due to configuration problems with the subject property. The access of the subject property is severely restricted for large trucks and the assessment should receive a negative adjustment of 5 -10%.

The Complainant presented four sales comparables that have been time adjusted using the City of Edmonton time adjustment factors. The sales have an average sale price of \$87.57psf and a median sale price of \$88.03psf. The Complainant pointed out that comparable #4 sold for \$76.75psf and it has a similar site configuration problem that makes it difficult for large trucks to access the shop.

The Complainant also presented four equity comparables that have an average assessment of \$83.87psf and a median assessment of \$81.93psf. Due to the attributes of the subject property, the Complainant determined that the subject should be valued at \$83.50 per square foot.

## **POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT**

The Respondent submitted that the subject assessment of \$3,158,000 is correct and equitable. The Respondent asserted that it is typical for many industrial properties to have large trucks entering and leaving the site. The Respondent disagrees with the Complainant that the subject property has an access problem.

The Respondent presented five sales comparables that range in value from \$90.34psf to \$147.66 compared with the subject assessment of \$88.60psf.

The Respondent also presented ten equity comparables that have assessments from \$88.82psf to \$108.45psf. The comparables are from the same neighborhood of Huff Bremner Estate as the subject property and they are similar in age, building size and site coverage.

## **Rebuttal**

The Respondent stated that the Complainant's sale #4 is a valid sale but it was not used in the audit because it has interior and exterior resonations being done which indicates that the sale was not a typical sale.

## **DECISION**

The property assessment is confirmed at \$3,158,000.

## **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

The Board reviewed the sales evidence of the Complainant and finds that sale #4 is not similar to the subject in terms of condition. The Complainant's sales #1, #2 and #3 are similar in age, building size and site coverage, but they are in inferior locations. The subject is located on 118 Avenue which is a major traffic route.

With respect to the issue of access, the Complainant did not provide any market evidence that the market value of the subject property is affected by the access/egress issue, therefore no adjustment to the assessment will be made for this reason.

The Complainant's equity comparables are quite similar in age, site coverage and size of building, however, the locations tend to be inferior.

The Board also reviewed the Respondent's sales comparables and eliminated sales #4 and #5 because they are about thirty years newer than the subject property. Sales #1, #2 and #3 are similar in age size and site coverage. It is noted that sale #1 is in fair condition and sold for \$99.32psf. Sales comparables #2 and #3 sold for \$101.65psf and \$90.34psf respectively. Based on this sales evidence, the Board finds the subject to be correctly assessed.

After reviewing the Respondent's equity comparables, all of which are located in Huff Bremner, the Board is satisfied that the subject property is assessed equitably with similar properties.

Accordingly, the assessment is confirmed.

Dated this 8<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2011, at the City of Edmonton, in the Province of Alberta.

---

Robert 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:   Nearctic Development Corporation Ltd