



## **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 438/10**

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> 2209286	<b>Municipal Address</b> 14505 124 Avenue NW	<b>Legal Description</b> Plan: 7069KS Block: 5 Lot: 9
<b>Assessed Value</b> \$2,161,000	<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**

Steve Radenic, Assessor  
Steve Lutes, 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 1966 and located in the Dominion Industrial subdivision of the City of Edmonton. The property has a total building area of 18,656 square feet and site coverage of 24%.

## **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?
- Should the subject receive an adjustment for perpendicular configuration?

## **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 five direct sales comparables ranging in value from \$67.66 to \$114.10 per sq. ft. with an average of \$84.49 per sq. ft. (\$91.00 per sq. ft. on main floor only).

The Complainant argued that the assessment is incorrect and based on the sales comparables provided requested a reduction to \$84.48 per sq. ft. or \$1,576,000.

The Complainant further argued that the building should receive a 5% downward adjustment due to the irregular shape.

### **POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT**

The Respondent submitted four direct sales comparables ranging in value from \$103.98 to \$151.16 per sq. ft. with an average of \$137.13 per sq. ft.

Further, the Respondent presented eight equity comparables ranging in value from \$102.06 to \$127.81 per sq. ft.

The Respondent argued that these comparables support the assessment of the subject property and requested confirmation of the current assessment.

### **DECISION**

The decision of the Board is to confirm the assessment at \$2,161,000.

### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

The Board is of the opinion that the best indicators of value are derived from both parties' comparables. The Complainant's sale # 2 with similar site coverage as the subject, larger area and age comparability indicates \$114.10 per sq. ft. (after time adjustment). Further, the Respondent's sale # 1 on the same block, similar in age, site coverage and size as the subject indicates a value of \$146.97 per sq. ft. The indicated range of these sales (\$114 to \$146 per sq. ft.) indicates the subject falls to the bottom of the range.

In regard to the irregular building issue, the Board did not receive sufficient evidence as to how this issue would impact the value of the improvement.

### **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  
York Realty Inc.