**MINUTES**

**CITY OF SASKATOON**

**BOARD OF REVISION**

Date: April 11, 2017

Location: Council Chambers

Session: 9:00 a.m.

**PRESENT:** Marvin Dutton, Panel Chair

Colin Butler, Board Member

Dennis Will, Board Member

Penny Walter, Board of Revision Panel Clerk

The appellants were advised that the proceedings were being recorded for the purposes of the Board and the Secretary. The Chair introduced the Board members and the Secretary and briefly outlined the procedures that would be followed during the course of the hearing. Those present were also informed that all witnesses, including appellants and the Assessor, would be sworn under oath, or affirm that their statements are true, before their testimony would begin.

1. **Appeal No. 5-2017**

**Civic Address: 204 27th Street West**

**Legal Description: Parcel(s) 136291901**

**Roll No. 494935100**

## Appearing for the Appellant

Frank J. Scholz

Appearing for the Respondent

Mr. Randy McKay Advocate, Senior Assessment Appraiser, Assessment and Taxation

Ms. Sandra Shyluk, Residential Assessment Manager, Assessment and Taxation

Ms. Jenny Foss, Assessment Appraiser, Assessment and Taxation

Grounds and Issues

The Appellant’s appeal is based on the narrow 15ft lot width. Section 31A of the Zoning Bylaw only allows a 2.5 feet on either side of the dwelling. On August 23, 1977, the City of Saskatoon refused to issue a building permit to build a room over the kitchen because of the narrowness of the lot. Two previous appeal cycles saw the assessment reduced because of the narrowness of the lot and the size of the house. The comparable houses have lots that are wider but shorter; to compare the overall square footage is unfair when the narrow lot brings with it restrictions on improving the property and resale. The computer multiple regression doesn’t have any consideration for the lot ratio it just goes by area which is a defect.

## Exhibits

A.1 Notice of Appeal from Frank Scholz to the Board of Revision, received January 17, 2017

A.2 Appellant’s submission to the Board of Revision, received February 10, 2017

A.3 Appellant’s submission to the Board of Revision, received February 27, 2017

A.4 Appellant’s submission to the Board of Revision, received February 28, 2017

A.5 Appellant’s submission to the Board of Revision, received March 3, 2017

A.6 Appellant’s submission to the Board of Revision, received March 7, 2017

A.7 Appellant’s submission to the Board of Revision, received March 22, 2017

A.8 Appellant’s submission to the Board of Revision, received March 27, 2017

A.9 Appellant’s submission to the Board of Revision, received April 9, 2017

\*\*A.10 Appellant’s submission to the Board of Revision, received April 11, 2017

R.1 2017 Assessment submitted by the City Assessor titled “Residential Property Market Area 9 Appeal Response,” received April 3, 2017.

(1) Undertaking Request Requested by Panel April 25, 2017

(1) Undertaking Response From Assessment April 25, 2017

(2) Undertaking Request Requested by Panel April 28, 2017

(2) Undertaking Response From Assessment May 10, 2017

Supplementary Notations

All giving testimony affirmed to tell the truth at the commencement of the hearings.

Conclusion

For the reasons given in the Record of Decision dated May 25, 2017 the appeal is adjusted and the filing fee is refunded.

The hearing concluded at 11:24 a.m.

As Secretary to the above Board of Revision Panel, I certify that these are accurate minutes of the hearings held on April 11, 2017.

Penny Walter, Panel Clerk

Board of Revision