CARB 1246/2012-P

CALGARY ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD DECISION WITH REASONS

In the matter of the complaint against the property assessment as provided by the *Municipal Government Act*, Chapter M-26, Section 460, Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000 (the Act).

between:

Standen's Limited(as represented by AltusGroup Limited), COMPLAINANT

and

The City Of Calgary, RESPONDENT

before:

Board Chair, J.Zezulka Board Member, A. Huskinson Board Member, J. Massey

This is a complaint to the Calgary Assessment Review Board in respect of aproperty assessment prepared by the Assessor of The City of Calgary and entered in the 2012 Assessment Roll as follows:

ROLL NUMBER: 200564383

LOCATION ADDRESS:5760 - 11 Street SE

HEARING NUMBER:68395

ASSESSMENT: \$6,840,000

Page 2 of4

CARB 1246/2012-P

This complaint was heard on the1st day of August, 2012, at the office of the Assessment Review Board located at Floor Number Four, 1212 – 31 Avenue NE, Calgary, Alberta, Boardroom Four.

Appeared on behalf of the Complainant:

R. Worthington

Appeared on behalf of the Respondent:

• G. Bell

Board's Decision in Respect of Procedural or Jurisdictional Matters:

(1) None

Property Description:

(2) The subject is comprised of the Standens premises. The property consists of a 65,537 square foot (s.f.) single tenant industrial warehouse, and a 7,399 s.f. industrial outbuilding, situated on a 5.81 acre site. The buildings were constructed in 1973. Total site coverage calculates to 25.68 per cent. The City classifies 0.272044689 acres as extra land. The location is the Burns Industrial Park in the central region of the City.

Issues / Appeal Objectives

(3) The City has assessed the property using the sales comparison approach. The total assessment calculates to \$104.50 per s.f., including both buildings and the extra land.

(4) There are two issues that make up this complaint;

a) The "extra" land is not subdividable, and therefore does not add additional value to the property, and

b)The current assessment does not realistically reflect market value, and is inequitable with similar properties.

Complainant's Requested Value:

(5) \$5,310,000, amended to \$6,260,000 at the hearing.

Evidence / Argument

(6) The Complainant submitted five comparable sales that reflect time adjusted selling prices ranging from \$83 to \$133 per s.f.. The median is \$109 per s.f. The median assessment of the sampling is \$75.96 per s.f., or an assessment to sales ratio of 77 per cent. All of these comparables have a significantly higher site coverage than the subject.

(7) The Complainant also submitted six equity comparables that reflect a median assessment of \$88.87 per s.f..

(8) The Respondent submitted five comparable sales, of which one was withdrawn at the

Page 3 of4

CARB 1246/2012-P

hearing. The sales reflected time adjusted selling prices of \$107.92 to \$147.33 per s.f. The two highest relative indicators were reflected by comparables in the SE region, both of which are significantly smaller than the subject. The two comparables in the central region reflected per s.f. amounts of \$107.92 and \$108.33. Site coverage for these two properties is 55.18 and 38.86 per cent. One, at 7130-Fisher Road SE, has 41 per cent interior finish, compared to the subject at 1 per cent. None of these could be considered truly comparable to the subject.

(9) The Respondent also submitted four equity comparables. Assessments per s.f. range from \$87.85 to \$107.14. The average calculates to \$95.82, and the median is \$94.15.

Board's Findings

(10) The Respondent's equity comparables contradict the values indicated by the Respondent's sales comparables.

(11) For the reasons mentioned in paragraphs (8) and (10), this Board gives little recognition to the Respondent's sales evidence.

(12) In the Board's opinion, the evidence submitted by the Complainant was not compelling enough to prompt the Board to depart from the conclusions indicated by the Respondents equity comparables. These reflect an average assessment of \$95.82 per s.f.

Board's Decision

(13) The assessment of the subject is reduced to \$96 per s.f., or \$6,291,552, truncated to \$6,290,000.

13th

DAY OF September, 2012.

DATED AT THE CITY OF CALGARY THIS

Jerry Zezulka **Presiding Officer**

CARB 1246/2012-P

APPENDIX "A"

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED AT THE HEARING AND CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD:

NO.

ITEM

1. C1Evidence Submission of the Complainant

2. C2 Rebuttal Submission of the Complainant

3. R1Evidence Submission of the Respondent

An appeal may be made to the Court of Queen's Bench on a question of law or jurisdiction with respect to a decision of an assessment review board.

Any of the following may appeal the decision of an assessment review board:

- (a) the complainant;
- (b) an assessed person, other than the complainant, who is affected by the decision;
- (c) the municipality, if the decision being appealed relates to property that is within the boundaries of that municipality;
- (d) the assessor for a municipality referred to in clause (c).

An application for leave to appeal must be filed with the Court of Queen's Bench within 30 days after the persons notified of the hearing receive the decision, and notice of the application for leave to appeal must be given to

- (a) the assessment review board, and
- (b) any other persons as the judge directs.

For MGB Administrative Use Only

Decision No. 1246/2012 - P			Roll No. 200564383	
<u>Subject</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Detail</u>	Issue
CARB	Industrial	Equity	N/A	Comparables, extra land allocation