



## ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD

Churchill Building  
10019 103 Avenue  
Edmonton AB T5J 0G9  
Phone: (780) 496-5026

### NOTICE OF DECISION NO. 0098 718/11

Altus Group Ltd  
17327 - 106A Avenue NW  
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 on January 17, 2012, respecting a complaint for:

Roll Number	Municipal Address	Legal Description	Assessed Value	Assessment Type	Assessment Notice for:
1066380	3738 - 97 Street NW	Plan: 8121339 Block: 20 Lot: 11C	\$3,026,500	Annual New	2011

#### Before:

Steven Kashuba, Presiding Officer  
Judy Shewchuk, Board Member  
Ron Funnell, Board Member

#### Board Officer:

Annet Adetunji

#### Persons Appearing on behalf of Complainant:

Walid Melhem, Altus Group Ltd

#### Persons Appearing on behalf of Respondent:

Mary-Alice Nagy, Assessor, City of Edmonton  
Stephen Leroux, Assessor, City of Edmonton

## **PRELIMINARY MATTERS**

1. At the request of the Respondent the witnesses were administered oaths or affirmations.

## **BACKGROUND**

2. The subject property is a single building warehouse built in 1979 with 27,040 square feet of floor space. Located in the Strathcona Industrial Park zoned IM in the southeast quadrant of the city, the site coverage is 41% on a lot of 1.5 acres or 65,339 square feet. The current assessment is \$3,026,500.

## **ISSUE(S)**

3. Is the 2011 assessment of \$3,026,500 fair and equitable?

## **LEGISLATION**

### ***Municipal Government Act, RSA 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**

4. The Complainant presented four sales comparables (Exhibit C-1, page 8) with time adjusted sale prices ranging from \$91.52 to \$118.52 per square foot and an average of \$100.79 per square foot for the total leasable area. Based on the sales comparables the Complainant submitted that the assessment of the subject property should be reduced from \$111.93 to \$95.00 per square foot for a total of \$2,568,500.

## **POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT**

5. The Respondent presented six sales comparables (Exhibit R-1, page 18) with time adjusted sale prices ranging from \$100.36 to \$159.59 per square foot for the total area of the building. Sales comparables #3 and #4 were the same as the Complainant's sales comparables #1 and #2.
6. The Respondent argued that each of the Complainant's sales comparables were comparable when adjusted for the fact that none were situated on main roadways while the subject is located on a major road. The Respondent further argued that the assessment of the subject falls within the range of time adjusted sale prices of their comparables.

7. The Respondent asked that the Board confirm the 2011 assessment at \$3,026,500 based upon a calculation of \$111.92 per square foot of total area.

### **DECISION**

- 8. It is the decision of the Board to confirm the assessment of the subject property for 2011 at \$3,026,500.**

### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

9. The Board finds that the Complainant's sales comparables, when adjusted for the location of the subject on a major road, support the assessment.
10. The Board finds that the Respondent's sales comparables, especially comparable #5 located in the same subdivision as the subject property with a time-adjusted sale price of \$112.15 per square foot, also support the current assessment.

### **DISSENTING OPINION AND REASONS**

There was no dissenting opinion.

Dated this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of February, 2012, at the City of Edmonton, in the Province of Alberta.

---

Steven Kashuba, 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, RSA 2000, c M-26.*

---

cc: SORREL ENTERPRISES LTD