

## **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:

***Dynacorp Group Limited (as represented by Assessment Advisory Group Inc. (AAG)),***  
**COMPLAINANT**

and

***The City Of Calgary, RESPONDENT***

before:

***K. Thompson, Board Chair***  
***J. Kerrison, MEMBER***  
***Y. Nesry, MEMBER***

This is a complaint to the Calgary Assessment Review Board in respect of a property assessment prepared by the Assessor of The City of Calgary and entered in the 2013 Assessment Roll as follows:

**ROLL NUMBER:** 201045853  
**LOCATION ADDRESS:** 5325 6 St SE  
**FILE NUMBER:** 71946  
**ASSESSMENT:** \$1,870,000

This complaint was heard on 14th day of August, 2013 at the office of the Assessment Review Board located at Floor Number 3, 1212 – 31 Avenue NE, Calgary, Alberta, Boardroom 8.

Appeared on behalf of the Complainant:

- D. Bowman Agent, Assessment Advisory Group Inc. (AAG)

Appeared on behalf of the Respondent:

- J. Tran Assessor, City Of Calgary
- M. Hartmann Assessor, City Of Calgary

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

[1] No procedural or jurisdictional matters were raised. The Board proceeded to hear the merits of the complaint.

**Property Description:**

[2] The subject property is a single tenant C- quality warehouse consisting of 9,250 square feet (sq. ft.), with 51% Finish, 9.86% Site Coverage and constructed in 1961. This property is located in South Manchester Industrial Park, has 1.57 acres of land, with a Land Use Designation (LUD) of Industrial-General (I-G). This property has 1.05 acres of excess land and has a topography influence reducing the total value by 30%. The subject property is assessed at \$202.37/ sq. ft. arrived at through the Sales Comparison Approach to Value and has an assessed value of \$1,870,000.

**Issues:**

[3] The 2013 assessment value is greater than the market value as of July 1, 2012 and is inequitable in relation to assessment values of similar properties, \$162/ sq. ft would produce a better market value for this property.

**Complainant's Requested Value:** \$1,490,000

**Board's Decision:**

[4] The Assessment is confirmed at the value of \$1,870,000

**Legislative Authority, Requirements and Considerations:**

[5] The Municipal Government Act, Section 460.1(2), subject to Section 460(11), a composite assessment review board has jurisdiction to hear complaints about any matter

referred to in Section 460(5) that is shown on an assessment notice for property, other than property described in Subsection 460 (1)(a).

### **Position of the Parties**

#### **Complainant's Position:**

[6] The Complainant's stated that the subject property's assessed \$202.37/ sq. ft. is higher than the price per square foot of sales of comparable properties in this area.

[7] The Complainant produced three sales comparables. The median time adjusted sale price per sq. ft. of three sales was \$162/ sq. ft. These three sale properties were C, and two C-quality warehouses, in the central region of the City [pg.14, C-1]. The three sales showed a range of \$133 to \$191 as the time adjusted sale price/ sq. ft. RealNet and Assessment documents were provided on the sale properties.

[8] The Complainant included the 2013 assessed values for the sale properties and calculated an assessment to sale ratio (ASR) for each of them. The Complainant stated that the resulting range of ASR's from 1.06 to 1.36 is well over the typically acceptable range of .95 to 1.05. This, according to the Complainant shows that the assessments of all three sale properties are over assessed. Assessments per sq. ft. of the three comparable sale properties ranged from \$178 to \$195.

#### **Respondent's Position:**

[9] The Respondent spoke to the Complainant's sales evidence [pg 12, R-1] reviewing each comparable based on how equitable the properties were to the subject. The first comparable was an industrial property with two buildings on the property. The remaining two sales presented by the Complainant had considerably more site coverage when compared to the subject property. The subject property has only 9.87% site coverage whereas two of the Complainant's sales comparables had 24% and 48% coverage. A chart was presented by the Respondent to show how the rate/ sq. ft. changes on these two comparables once they were adjusted so they had equal site coverage to the subject. Adjusted values were \$235.49/ sq. ft. and \$257.80/ sq. ft. The median time adjusted sale price/ sq. ft. changes to \$246.64 therefore supporting the subject properties 202.37/ sq. ft. rate.

[10] The Respondent provided evidence of four warehouse sales in the central area of the city (one in the south east region) [pg. 14, R-1] to show that the typical values/ sq. ft. used by the City were reasonable for the subject property. The Respondent stated for assessment purposes the task was to assess all similar properties at a similar value. This requires analysis of all the sales within the group of similar properties to arrive at a typical value/ sq. ft. and not to just reflect one or two sale prices. Further the Respondent went on to say that the subject property's value should fall within the range of probable selling prices within that group, and the subject property does fall within that range.

[11] The Respondent went through the four warehouse sales it provided, indicating how the subject fit in within the components that were deemed contributing factors to the final value. Those components were Building Type, Parcel Size, Land Use Designation, Assessable Building Area, Year of Construction, Non-Residential Zone, percent of Finish, Site Coverage, and Excess/Additional Land. While there were a number of differences noted between the

subject property and the sales comparables, the Respondent noted the subject property was in fact at a lower rate per square foot than all four sales of reasonably similar properties. The Respondent also pointed out that two of its sales had equally low site coverage when compared to the subject and they supported a median assessment of \$259.37/ sq. ft.

[12] The Respondent's time adjusted sale price/ sq. ft. ranged from \$241.38 to \$290.83 with a median of \$259.28. The subject being assessed at \$202.37. A time adjustment graph was also provided to show any adjustments to the sale prices.

[13] Four equity comparables were also put into evidence by the Respondent showing that the subject property was assessed equitable to similar properties. The subject's \$289.10 unadjusted rate /sq. ft (removing the 30% reduction for topography) was compared to the median of the four comparables which was 288.68/ sq. ft.

#### **Board's Reasons for Decision:**

[14] The Board reviewed all the comparable sale information provided as evidence by both the Complainant and Respondent. Upon review of all the comparable sales, the Board paid particular attention to the two properties deemed most comparable to the subject, one each indicated by the Complainant and Respondent


[15] The Board concluded that a great deal of the sale evidence relied upon the time adjusted sale price being correct, however there was nothing in the Complainant's evidence to indicate how the time adjustments were arrived at, except by way of the Complainant's explanation that the price increase over time. The Complainant stated that sales were reviewed and a factor was developed to quantify the time adjustment. The Respondent provided time adjustment information in the evidence package but didn't speak to it.

[16] Little evidence was presented by either party on the difference in value attributed to factors such as Multi vs. Single Tenanted Warehouses, Site Coverage, and location of sales in different industrial parks and percent of Finish on the sale property improvements when compared to the subject improvement. The Respondent gave good evidence of how the low site coverage affects the value and the resulting adjustments made to account for this resulted in support for the subject property value.

[17] The Board gave consideration to the equity comparables produced by the Respondent which showed the subject property's rate/ sq. ft. within the range of values of similar properties.

[18] The Board found the Complainant did not provide sufficient evidence to warrant changing the assessed value.

DATED AT THE CITY OF CALGARY THIS 9<sup>th</sup> DAY OF September 2013.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
K. Thompson

**Presiding Officer**

**APPENDIX "A"****DOCUMENTS PRESENTED AT THE HEARING  
AND CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD:**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>ITEM</b>
1. C1	Complainant Disclosure
2. R1	Respondent Disclosure

*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.*

Property Type	Property Sub-Type	Issue	Sub issue
warehouse	Single Tenant	Market value too high	Inequitable to similar properties