



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 428/10

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 1484252	Municipal Address 11140 154 Street NW	Legal Description Plan: RN58 Block: 5 Lot: 5
Assessed Value \$1,348,500	Assessment Type Annual – New	Assessment Notice for: 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

Steve Radenic, 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 1973 and located in the High Park Industrial subdivision of the City of Edmonton. The property has a total building area of 9,000 square feet and site coverage of 21%.

ISSUES

The Complainant had attached a schedule listing numerous issues to the complaint form. However, most of those issues had been abandoned and the issues left to be decided were as follows:

- What is the typical market value of the subject property?
- When compared to comparable property assessments, is the subject property's assessment equitable?

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 three direct sales comparables ranging from \$80.15 to \$108.64 per sq. ft. with an average of \$91.87 per sq. ft. (\$107.20 per sq. ft. on main floor only).

Further, the Complainant presented eight equity comparables ranging from \$90.54 to \$167.79 per sq. ft. with an average of \$149.83 per sq. ft.

POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT

The Respondent presented seven direct sales comparables ranging from \$156.92 to \$232.65 per sq. ft. with an average of \$188.77 per sq. ft.

Further, the Respondent presented five equity comparables ranging from \$158.83 to \$177.75 per sq. ft. with an average of \$164.43 per sq. ft.

The Respondent argued that these comparables support the assessment of the subject and requested the Board to confirm the assessment.

DECISION

The decision of the Board is to confirm the assessment of the subject at \$1,348,500.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Of the three sales comparables presented by the Complainant, sale # 1 appears to be in error in regard to value per sq. ft. and size, while sale # 3 has four thousand square feet of mezzanine space or second floor space, whereas the subject is single storey.

Three of the Respondent's direct sales comparables are on major arterial roads which appear to be of higher value per sq. ft. than the subject.

Further, the Complainant's equity comparables # 5, # 6 and # 8 would appear to support the current value of the subject property, in addition to the equity comparables presented by the Respondent.

The Board is of the opinion that the best indicator of value is the Respondent's sale comparable # 3 at \$156.98 per sq. ft., similar in size and year built to the subject although with slightly lower site coverage. This comparable supports the assessment of the subject at \$149.83 per sq. ft.

DISSENTING OPINION AND REASONS

There was no dissenting opinion.

Dated this 4th day of November, 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
Gregg Properties Co. Ltd.