



## **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 417/10**

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:

<b>Roll Number</b> 10008266	<b>Municipal Address</b> 9410 51 Avenue NW	<b>Legal Description</b> Plan: 0323387 Block: 19 Lot: 5A
<b>Assessed Value</b> \$3,401,000	<b>Assessment Type</b> Annual – New	<b>Assessment Notice for:</b> 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**

Suzanne Magdiak, Assessor  
Tanya Smith, 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 1993 and located in the Coronet Industrial subdivision of the City of Edmonton. The subject has a total building area of 17,288 square feet with 15% site coverage.

## **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:

- 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 equity comparables ranging in value from \$155.79 to \$189.67 per sq. ft. with an average of \$175.26 per sq. ft. The Complainant indicated that sales

comparables # 3 and # 4 at \$184.96 and \$189.67 per sq. ft. respectively, similar in site coverage, size and somewhat newer than the subject are considered the best comparables.

### **POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT**

The Respondent provided seven direct sales comparables ranging in value from \$173.74 to \$229.92 per sq. ft. These comparables are similar in site coverage although sales comparables # 5, # 6 and # 7 are smaller buildings (R-a42, page 18).

Further, the Respondent presented six equity comparables ranging in value from \$185 to \$198 per sq. ft. in support of his argument that the assessment is fair and equitable (R-a42, page 19).

### **DECISION**

The decision of the Board is to reduce the current assessment to \$3,146,500.

### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

The Board is of the opinion that the best indicators of value were represented by the Complainant's comparables # 3 and # 4 indicating values of \$184.96 and \$189.67 per sq. ft., with adjustment required for time, site coverage and building area.

The Respondent's sales comparables # 4 (with adjustment for site coverage) at \$178.66 per sq. ft. and sale # 7 at \$180.25 per sq. ft. (with adjustment for age), appear to be somewhat comparable to the subject. Overall, the Board is of the opinion that \$182 per sq. ft. best represents the value of the subject, and accordingly reduces the assessment to \$3,146,500.

### **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  
A R Williams Truck Equipment Ltd.