



## ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD

MAIN FLOOR CITY HALL  
1 SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL SQUARE  
EDMONTON, ALBERTA T5J 2R7  
(780) 496-5026 FAX (780) 496-8199

July 12, 2010

**NOTICE OF DECISION NO. 0098 55/10**

ALTUS GROUP LTD  
17327 - 106A AVE  
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 Assessment Review Board (ARB) from a hearing held on July 05, 2010 respecting an appeal on the 2010 Annual New Realty Assessment.

Roll Number	Municipal Address	Legal Description	Assessed Value	Assessment Type	Assessment Year
3024585	9530 49 Avenue NW	Plan: 8421720 Block: 3 Lot: 18	547,000	Annual New	2010
8978306	9511 35 Avenue NW	Plan: 7821552 Block: 21 Lot: 2	844,000	Annual New	2010
3024593	9520 49 Avenue NW	Plan: 8421720 Block: 3 Lot: 19	542,500	Annual New	2010
1075746	4703 93 Avenue NW	Plan: 7820294 Block: 9 Lot: 3	4,133,500	Annual New	2010
8956146	9335 27 Avenue NW	Plan: 7823307 Block: 11 Lot: 16	819,500	Annual New	2010
8623001	9919 67 Avenue NW	Plan: 3888HW Block: 34 Lot: 7	718,000	Annual New	2010
8479875	4704 101 Street NW	Plan: 7621629 Block: 1 Lot: 19	379,000	Annual New	2010
4079356	3650 98 Street NW	Plan: 8922205 Block: 4 Lot: 12	1,385,000	Annual New	2010
1590272	11404 170 Street NW	Plan: 8022130 Block: 1 Lot: 10A	1,050,000	Annual New	2010

### Before:

Tom Robert, Presiding Officer  
George Zaharia, Board Member  
Dale Doan, Board Member



**Persons Appearing: Complainant**

Chris Buchanan, Altus Group Ltd

**Persons Appearing: Respondent**

Gordon Petrunik, Assessment and Taxation Branch  
Veronika Ferenc-Berry, Law Branch

**PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

Both parties agreed to carry forward evidence and argument on the nine roll numbers as indicated. The property put forward as a representative indicator of value was roll number 3024585, 9530 – 49A Avenue NW. The subject property is fenced vacant industrial land located in the Papaschase Industrial Area. The property is comprised of 32,616 sq. ft.

**ISSUE(S)**

The market value of the subject, as well as fairness and equity with similar surround 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 sales comparables indicating an average of 13.67 per sq. ft. (adjusted). All of the sales were zoned similar to the subject (1M – 1B) ranging in size from 73,102 sq. ft. to 106,292 sq. ft. all within the same general area as the subject, all were 2008 sales.

**POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT**

The Respondent presented nine sales, relying on three, indicating a value range from 17.84 per sq. ft. to 25.54 per sq. ft. (adjusted). Sales were in 2007 and 2008.

**DECISION**

The Board confirms the land value of the subject property at 542,962 and the 2010 assessment of the subject property at \$547,000.

Based on the carry forward of evidence and argument as agreed to, the Board confirms the following assessments represented by the corresponding roll numbers:

8978306 - \$844,000  
3024593 - \$542,500  
1075746 - \$4,133,500  
8956146 - \$819,500  
8623001 - \$718,000  
8479875 - \$379,000  
4079356 - \$1,385,000  
1590272 - \$1,050,000

### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

The Board reviewed all of the sales presented and was of the opinion that the best comparables were those closest to the subject property, with similar zoning. Sales at 9275 – 25 Avenue indicate adjusted values of 19.79 and 25.54 per sq. ft. (last sale). These sales are the closest in proximity to the subject with the same zoning. The comparables presented by the Complainants, with the same zoning as the subject 1B have adjusted sale prices of 14.96 and 14.17 per sq. ft., however are not within the same area as the subject.

The issue regarding the value of the improvements (fence) to be reduced to \$1069 from \$4956 due to no depreciation being applied by the City was reviewed. The Board was of the opinion that this issue was not sufficiently supported by evidence or argument.

### **DISSENTING DECISION AND REASONS**

There were no dissenting opinions.

Dated this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2010 at the City of Edmonton, in the Province of Alberta.

---

Presiding Officer

---

CC: Municipal Government Board