

Edmonton Composite Assessment Review Board

Citation: Altus Group v The City of Edmonton, ECARB 2012-000997

Assessment Roll Number: 10209758
Municipal Address: 4523 94 STREET NW
Assessment Year: 2012
Assessment Type: Annual New

Between:

Altus Group

Complainant

and

The City of Edmonton, Assessment and Taxation Branch

Respondent

DECISION OF
John Noonan, Presiding Officer
Jasbeer Singh, Board Member
John Braim, Board Member

Preliminary Matters

[1] Upon questioning by the Presiding Officer, the parties indicated they had no objection to the composition of the Board. In addition, the Board members indicated they had no bias on this file.

[2] Witnesses giving testimony were either sworn in or affirmed, the choice being that of the individual witness.

[3] Evidence, argument and submissions were carried forward to this file from #8956146 where applicable.

Background

[4] The subject property is a parcel of undeveloped land in the Papaschase Industrial subdivision of the City of Edmonton. Located at 4523 - 94 Street NW the subject parcel is an interior lot with an area of 40,700 square feet (0.934 acres) and is zoned IL. The 2012 assessment for the land is \$608,500 and is under complaint.

Issue(s)

[5] Is the 2012 assessment of \$608,500 fair?

Legislation

[6] The Municipal Government Act reads:

Municipal Government Act, RSA 2000, c M-26

s 1(1)(n) “market value” means the amount that a property, as defined in section 284(1)(r), might be expected to realize if it is sold on the open market by a willing seller to a willing buyer;

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

[7] The Complainant appealed the 2012 assessment on the basis that the subject property’s assessment of \$608,500 was excessive and inequitable. In support of this position, the Complainant presented a 50 page assessment brief (Exhibit C-1) that included a set of 16 sales comparables in respect of similar industrial lots with interior locations, same as the subject.

[8] The Complainant argued that the sales comparables before the Board were very comparable to the subject in terms of size (between 1 and 3 acres), location (all were located in the interior) and were similarly zoned (IB, IL or IM). The median time adjusted sales price in respect of these comparables was \$13.46 which, in the Complainant’s opinion, supported his request for a lower 2012 assessment of \$13.50 per square foot instead of \$14.96 per square foot, as currently assessed. (C-1, pages 7 & 8).

[9] The Complainant advised the Board that the City of Edmonton’s time adjustment factors (C-1, pages 12-13) indicated a downward trend in industrial land values for 2011 and argued that the requested lower assessment addressed that.

[10] The Complainant requested the Board to reduce the 2012 assessment to \$13.50 per square foot or \$549,000 for the entire parcel of land.

Position of the Respondent

[11] The Respondent presented to the Board a 71 page document including an assessment brief and a law & legislation brief (R-1). The assessment brief included a set of six sales comparables that supported the subject's 2012 assessment of \$608,500 as fair and equitable.

[12] The Respondent provided six sales comparables in support of the subject's assessment. The average and median of time adjusted sales prices of these comparables were shown to be \$14.87 and \$14.90 per square foot, respectively and supported the subjects 2012 assessment at \$14.96 per square foot. (R-1, page 10). Three of the Respondent's sales comparables (located at 4604 – 53 Avenue, 3601 – 53 Avenue and 5321 – 47 Avenue) were also included in the Complainant's list of sales comparables.

[13] The Respondent argued that many of the Complainant's sales comparables were dated, having occurred in 2007 and 2008, whereas all six of the Respondent's sales occurred between Feb 2010 and Mar 2011, and were much closer to the valuation date (Jul 01, 2011) and hence, provided a better representation of the actual market conditions on the valuation date.

[14] The Respondent pointed out to the Board that the Complainant's sales comparable #1 (6104 – 72A Avenue NW) had an irregular shape, little exposure and a constrained access and therefore, was not a good comparable. Similarly, the Complainant's sales comparable #14 (1235 – 70 Avenue NW) was also not a good comparable as it was located near the end of a roadway and did not enjoy through or bi-directional traffic.

[15] The Respondent argued that six of the sales comparables presented by the Complainant (#3, #4, #6, #10, #11 & #12 on C-1, page 8) supported the subject's assessment and requested the Board to confirm the subject's 2012 assessment at \$608,500 or \$14.96 per square foot.

Decision

[16] The Decision of the Board is to reduce the 2012 assessment to \$568,000.

Reasons for the Decision

[17] The Board noted that all six of the Respondent's six comparable sales occurred within sixteen months of the valuation date, were all from the SE Industrial quadrant as the subject, and three of these comparables were also included in the Complainant's set of 16 sales comparables.

[18] The Board the Respondent's suggestion that the sales closer to the valuation date better represented the actual market conditions on the valuation date. However, the Board also noted that the City's mass appraisal model used for the 2012 assessments included valid sales going as far back as January 2007 and thus, excluding any of the Complainant's 16 sales comparables, on the grounds of these being dated, would be inappropriate.

[19] The Board was persuaded by the Respondent's reasoning as to why the Complainant's sales comparable #1 (6104 – 72A Avenue NW) with an irregular shape, little exposure and a constrained access and the sales comparable #14 (1235 – 70 Avenue NW), located near the end of a roadway and not having through or bi-directional traffic, were inferior to the subject for these reasons and were not good comparables for the assessment purposes.

[20] The Board found that the average of the time adjusted sales prices in respect of the Complainant's sales comparables, excluding the two inferior properties (#1 & #14) mentioned above was \$13.96 per square foot. Applying this rate to 40,698 square feet area of the subject property, the 2012 assessment amounted to \$568,000.

Dissenting Opinion

[21] There was no dissenting opinion

Heard commencing September 18, 2012.

Dated this 27th day of September, 2012, at the City of Edmonton, Alberta.

John Noonan, Presiding Officer

Appearances:

Chris Buchanan

for the Complainant

Daren Nagy

for the Respondent