



## ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD

MAIN FLOOR CITY HALL  
1 SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL SQUARE  
EDMONTON, ALBERTA T5J 2R7  
(780) 496-5026 FAX (780) 496-8199

July 5, 2010

**NOTICE OF DECISION NO. 0098 14/10**

WAY SYSTEMS INC  
211 3132 PARSONS ROAD  
EDMONTON, AB T6N 1L6

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 June 22, 2010 respecting an appeal on the 2010 Annual New Realty Assessment.

<b>Roll Number</b> 9994631	<b>Municipal Address</b> 211 Parsons Road	<b>Legal Description</b> Plan: 0220604 Unit: 28
<b>Assessed Value</b> \$571,500	<b>Assessment Type</b> Annual - New	<b>Assessment Year</b> 2010

### **Before:**

Pat Mowbrey, Presiding Officer  
George Zaharia, Board Member  
Judy Shewchuk, Board Member

### **Persons Appearing: Complainant**

Eugene Way

### **Persons Appearing: Respondent**

Allison Cossey, Assessor

### **PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

Upon questioning by the Presiding Officer, the parties present indicated no objection to the composition of the Board. In addition, the Board members indicated no bias with respect to this file.

There were no preliminary issues raised by the parties. The Respondent did have a Recommendation on the file, but brought it forward during the Merit Hearing.

### **ISSUE**

Is the 2010 Assessment of the subject property too high?



## **LEGISLATION**

### **The *Municipal Government Act*, R.S.A. 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**

1. The Complainant's position is that the subject office is on the second floor and at the back of the office complex, stated in Exhibit C-1, p.1, and for this reason has less value than other occupants of the subject complex.
2. The Complainant presented 3 assessment comparables, C-1, pages 3 – 8. The comparable assessments range from \$126.46 to \$189.81 per sq. ft. with an average assessment of \$152.00 per sq. ft.
3. The subject property is assessed at \$571,500 or \$262.83 per sq. ft.
4. The Complainant rebuts the sales comparable presented by the Respondent which is located in the same office building as the subject office, on the basis that it is located on the main floor with a mezzanine and has front exposure to Parsons Road (C-1, p.1).

## **POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT**

1. The Respondent's position is that the subject property is an office condominium unit located on the second floor of the office condominium complex and is finished to an office standard, R-1, p.21
2. The sales comparable that the Complainant rebuts, R1, p.32, is a retail space on the main floor of of the subject condominium complex, which sold July 29, 2008 for a sale price of \$590,000 or \$264.51 per sq. ft.
3. The Respondent states that office space is typically a higher level of finish than that of average retail sales space.
4. The Respondent provided 4 comparable sales R-1, pages 27 to 31, in a 2008 built office condominium development indicating sales prices ranging from \$267.73 to \$273.02 per sq. ft.

## **Recommendation**

The Respondent proposed a Recommendation to reduce the 2010 assessment to \$514,000, or \$236.00 per sq. ft., R 1 p.4. The reduced recommended 2010 assessment is based on exposure, as the subject property is located at the back of the building and has limited exposure to the highly trafficked Parsons Road, and it is supported by the comparable sales of similar condominium properties within comparable markets and neighbourhoods.

## **FINDINGS**

1. The subject property is an office condominium.
2. The subject property is located on the second floor at the rear of the building with minimal exposure to the high traffic on Parsons Road.

## **DECISION**

The Board accepts the Respondent's Recommendation to reduce the 2010 Assessment from \$571,500 to \$514,000.

## **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

1. The Board places greater weight on the evidence and sales comparables presented by the Respondent, R-1, pages 27 to 32, because the subject property is an office condominium and located in an office condominium complex.
2. The Board places less weight on the Complainant's comparables, C-1 pages 3 to 8, of which one is an office condominium complex and the other 2 are office buildings owned by individual owners.
3. The Board accepts the basis for the reduced adjustment correction to the 2010 assessment, which reflects the subject property has exposure to the back of the building and minimal visibility to the front and Parsons Road.

Dated this 5<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2010 A.D. at the City of Edmonton, in the Province of Alberta.

---

Presiding Officer

---

CC: MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT BOARD