



ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD

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

NOTICE OF DECISION NO. 0098 405/11

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:
10015416	16003 118 Avenue NW	Plan: 0420245 Block: 13 Lot: C	\$29,447,000	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 warehouse property located at 16003 118 Avenue NW in the Alberta Park Industrial neighborhood. The 744,688 square foot (sf) lot is improved with three buildings. Building #1 has an effective year built of 1998 and a total building area of 243,668sf. Building #2 has an effective year built of 1980 and a total building area of 108,927sf. Building #3 has an effective year built of 1993 and a total building area of 43,520sf. The site coverage is 49%.

ISSUE

Is the subject property assessment correct?

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. The Complainant argued that the direct sales approach indicates that the property value should be \$27,728,000. The Complainant presented five sales comparables that have been time adjusted using the City of Edmonton time adjustment factors. The comparables have an average sale price of \$75.35psf and a median sale price of \$75.11psf. Four of these five sales comparables were also used by the Respondent. On the strength of the five sales comparables presented, the Complainant requested the Board to reduce the assessment to \$27,728,000 or \$70.00 per square foot.

POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT

The Respondent defended the assessment with six sales comparables. As noted in the Complainant's position, four of these sales were used by the Complainant. The Respondent's sales comparables range in value from \$68.93psf to \$125.32psf. The Respondent pointed out that the property that sold for a low of \$68.93psf is in an inferior location to the subject location on 118 Avenue. The Respondent added that five of its sales are not on a major roadway therefore, the locations of these five properties are inferior to the subject location.

DECISION

The subject property assessment is confirmed at \$29,447,000.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The Board finds that the subject assessment is correct. The best indicators of value are the four sales comparables selected by both parties. These four comparables sold for an average sale price of \$77.32 per square foot compared with the subject assessment of \$74.34 per square foot. Accordingly, the assessment is confirmed.

Dated this 9th 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: Gregg Properties Co Ltd