

# 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 420/10

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> 10042949	Municipal Address 5723 67 Street NW	<b>Legal Description</b> Plan: 9826066 Block: 5 Lot: 17 & 18
Assessed Value \$13,101,500	Assessment Type Annual – New	Assessment Notice for: 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** 

Mary Carpentier, 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 large warehouse located in the Roper Industrial subdivision of the City of Edmonton. The property has a total building area of 125,141 square feet with 39 % 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:

- What is the typical market value of the subject?
- 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 one direct sale comparable at \$127.68 per sq. ft. indicating that there were insufficient comparables to determine a value via the direct sale comparison method.

were insufficient comparables to determine a value via the direct sale comparison method.

Further, the Complainant presented four equity comparables ranging in value after adjustments

from \$92.74 to \$99.17 per sq. ft.

POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT

The Respondent presented six sales comparables ranging in value from \$109.37 to \$139.91 per sq. ft., indicating sales # 1 & # 2 at \$109.37 and \$123.30 per sq. ft. respectively as most

comparable to the subject.

In support of his argument that the assessment is fair and equitable, the Respondent presented

seven equity assessment comparables ranging in value from \$99.16 to \$109.15 per sq. ft.

**DECISION** 

The decision of the Board is to confirm the assessment at \$13,101,500.

**REASONS FOR THE DECISION** 

The Board is of the opinion that the Respondent's sales comparables ranging from \$109.37 to \$139.91 per sq. ft., and the Complainant's sale comparable at \$127.68 per sq. ft., all indicate that

the subject assessed at \$104.69 per sq. ft. falls to an acceptable value within the range.

Further, the equity assessment range of \$99.16 to \$108.71 per sq. ft. presented by the Respondent

supports the value of \$104.69 per sq. ft.

**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

SREIT (Roper Land) Ltd.

3