

# 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 500/10

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 November 8, 2010 respecting a complaint for:

Roll Number 8053753	Municipal Address 9943 – 82 Avenue NW	<b>Legal Description</b> Plan: I Block: 58 Lot: 7
Assessed Value \$828,000	Assessment Type Annual New	Assessment Notice for: 2010

Before: Board Officer:

Tom Robert, Presiding Officer Tom Eapen, Board Member John Braim, Board Member J. Halicki

Persons Appearing: Complainant Persons Appearing: Respondent

Chris Buchanan, Agent Guo He, Assessor

Altus Group Ltd. Assessment and Taxation Branch

## **BACKGROUND**

The subject property is an auto service type property located in the Ritchie subdivision at 9943-82 Avenue. The subject is a stand-alone building with an area of 6,095 ft<sup>2</sup> and a land area of 13,057 ft<sup>2</sup>.

#### **ISSUE**

Is the subject property assessed fairly and equitably 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 argued that although the subject has been assessed on the income approach to value, the value per square foot of \$183.36 is excessive to comparable properties presented.

The Complainant presented fifteen comparables ranging in value from \$106.08 to \$193.50/ft<sup>2</sup> indicating an average of \$134.29/ft<sup>2</sup> and a median of \$131.50/ft<sup>2</sup>. The requested value of \$134.29/ft<sup>2</sup> equates to a value of \$606,413.

#### POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT

The Respondent argues that the subject is assessed by using the Income Approach because it is an income/investment property. Further, the Respondent provided ten comparable indicating rental rates from \$15.50 to  $$20.50/ft^2$  all with an 8.00% capitalization rate. The subject rental rate is  $$16.00/ft^2$  with an 8.00% capitalization rate. The Respondent argued that the rental rate of  $$16.00/ft^2$  falls to the bottom of the range of comparables and further, that the capitalization rate of 8.00% is comparable to the subject.

## **DECISION**

The decision of the Board is to confirm the 2010 assessment at \$828,000.

#### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

The Board is of the opinion that the Complainant's comparables are not within the same area of the subject and no adjustments have been applied.

The Board recognizes that the parties have argued on the basis of different approaches to value, arriving at a different conclusion.

The	Board	is	of	the	view	that	regardless	of	the	valuation	approach,	recognition	of:	location,
build	ding tyr	oe,	and	l age	e must	be c	onsidered i	n a	n ar	gument bas	sed on fairr	ness and equi	ty.	

## **DISSENTING OPINION AND REASONS**

There were no dissenting opinions.			
Dated this tenth day of November, 2010 Alberta.	A.D., at the City	of Edmonton, in the	Province of
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 City of Edmonton, Assessment and Taxation Branch Lazy B Corp.