



ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD

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

NOTICE OF DECISION NO. 0098 755/11

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 on January 24, 2012, respecting a complaint for:

Roll Number	Municipal Address	Legal Description	Assessed Value	Assessment Type	Assessment Notice for:
8888349		Plan: 6214NY Block: 19 Lot: 11	\$948,000	Annual New	2011

Before:

Steven Kashuba, Presiding Officer
James Wall, Board Member
Petra Hagemann, Board Member

Board Officer: Tannis Lewis

Persons Appearing on behalf of Complainant:

Walid Melhem, Senior Consultant, Altus Group Ltd

Persons Appearing on behalf of Respondent:

Melissa Zayac, Assessor, City of Edmonton
Steve Radenic, Assessor, City of Edmonton

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

1. At the outset of the hearing the Respondent told the Board that they had a recommendation for a reduction in the assessment amount on this file and that they wished to address this recommendation by way of a Preliminary Matter.
2. In response to a question of the Board, the Respondent submitted that they had a recommendation on this particular Roll Number to decrease the assessment from \$948,000 to \$824,000. This recommendation is based upon the Respondent's sales comparables as disclosed in Exhibit R-1, page 16.
3. The Board called a recess in order to provide both parties sufficient time to consider the Respondent's recommendation for a reduction in the assessment amount.

BACKGROUND

4. The subject property is a small warehouse located in the Davies Industrial West subdivision of the City of Edmonton. The property has a building area of 3,368 square feet on a site area of 51,884 square feet. The current assessment is \$948,000.

ISSUE(S)

5. The Complaint presented a Schedule of Issues as reflected in Exhibit C-1, page 5. However, all of these issues were abandoned with the exception of the following:
 - 5.1. Is the subject land assessed correctly when considering the sales values per square foot of similar properties?

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

6. Having considered the Respondent's recommendation for a reduction in the assessment amount, the Complainant told the Board that a reduction in the assessment from \$948,000 to \$824,000 was acceptable.

POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT

7. By way of a Preliminary Matter, the Respondent made reference to Exhibit R-1, page 16 which presented five sales comparables of similar properties and which reflected an average time-adjusted sales value of \$16.10 per square foot, while the subject is assessed at \$17.79 per square foot. By applying a value of \$15.40 per square foot to the subject property, the Respondent recommended a reduction in the assessment amount from \$948,000 to \$824,000.

DECISION

8. **It is the decision of the Board to reduce the assessment of the subject property for 2011 from \$948,000 to \$824,000.**

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

9. As noted by the Board within the Preliminary Matter and the Position of both parties, the Respondent had a recommendation to reduce the assessment of the subject property as a result of their five sales comparables presented in Exhibit R-1, page 16. This reduction was acceptable to the Complainant.

DISSENTING OPINION AND REASONS

10. There was no dissenting opinion.

Dated this 17th 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: GPM (11) GP INC