


TD 1999/D62 - Income tax: capital gains: in what circumstances is it reasonable to treat one CGT asset as 'substantially the same' as another CGT asset for the purposes of paragraphs 124-85(3)(b) and 124-95(6)(b) of the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997?

 This cover sheet is provided for information only. It does not form part of *TD 1999/D62 - Income tax: capital gains: in what circumstances is it reasonable to treat one CGT asset as 'substantially the same' as another CGT asset for the purposes of paragraphs 124-85(3)(b) and 124-95(6)(b) of the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997?*

This document has been finalised by TD 2000/45.

Draft Taxation Determination

Income tax: capital gains: in what circumstances is it reasonable to treat one CGT asset as 'substantially the same' as another CGT asset for the purposes of paragraphs 124-85(3)(b) and 124-95(6)(b) of the *Income Tax Assessment Act 1997*?

Preamble

Draft Taxation Determinations (DTDs) present the preliminary, though considered, views of the Australian Taxation Office (ATO). DTDs should not be relied on; only final Taxation Determinations represent authoritative statements by the ATO.

1. Under paragraph 124-85(3)(b) and paragraph 124-95(6)(b) of the *Income Tax Assessment Act 1997*, if:

- (a) you acquired a CGT asset before 20 September 1985 and it, or part of it, is lost or destroyed on the happening of a natural disaster; and
- (b) you incur expenditure to acquire another CGT asset,

you are taken to have acquired the other asset before that day if 'it is reasonable to treat the other asset as substantially the same as the original asset'.

2. Whether it is reasonable to treat a CGT asset as substantially the same as another is an objective question and the answer depends on the facts of each particular case. Consideration needs to be given to such matters as the nature of the replacement asset, the use to which it is put, its location, size, value, quality, and composition compared with those attributes of the original asset.

3. Application of this reasonableness test is best illustrated by examples.

Note:

4. We stress that the examples which follow are intended to be indicative only and the presence or absence of any factor specified in them would not necessarily be determinative of a change in result.

TD 1999/D62

original asset	market value before disaster	new asset	cost	substantially the same?
Example 1 <i>3 bedroom brick veneer house</i>	\$200,000	<i>4 bedroom brick veneer house built in accordance with new recommended structural design</i>	\$320,000	yes
Example 2 <i>2 bedroom 50 year old fibro rental cottage</i>	\$100,000	<i>newly built 5 bedroom double brick 2-storey rental house</i>	\$260,000	no
Example 3 <i>3 bedroom terrace house 40 km from the city centre</i>	\$170,000	<i>3 bedroom terrace house in the city centre</i>	\$370,000	no
Example 4 <i>piece of machinery used in a printing business</i>	\$20,000	<i>truck to be used for deliveries for the printing business</i>	\$70,000	no
Example 5 <i>a 12m² ice-cream counter in a shopping mall</i>	\$150,000	<i>a 50m² shop on the street opposite the mall used for the same business</i>	\$350,000	no
Example 6 <i>a 2000m², one storey warehouse used for a toy business</i>	\$500,000	<i>a two storey warehouse on a 1250m² block (totally 2500m² floor space) 10 metres down the road</i>	\$650,000	yes

5. *Having regard to the use, location, size, value, quality, and composition of the new assets, the following comments are offered:*

Example 1

6. *The new asset is similar to the original asset in all respects except the number of bedrooms and the structural design. We consider that it would be reasonable to treat the new asset as substantially the same as the original asset.*

Example 2

7. *The size, value, quality, use and composition of the new asset is different from the original asset. We consider that it would not be reasonable to treat the assets as substantially the same.*

Example 3

8. *While all factors except location and value are the same, the change in location and greatly increased value are enough to render it unreasonable to treat the assets as substantially the same.*

Example 4

9. *Although the asset is to be used in the same business, the complete change in its nature (from machinery to a truck) means that it is unreasonable to treat the assets as substantially the same.*

Example 5

10. *Although the asset is used in the same business, the nature, size and value of the premises are substantially different. It would not be reasonable to treat the premises as substantially the same.*

Example 6

11. *Having regard to the size and location of the warehouse, the new warehouse is similar to the original except for the number of storeys. It would be reasonable to treat the warehouses as substantially the same.*

Your comments

We invite you to comment on this Draft Taxation Determination. We are allowing 4 weeks for comments before we finalise the Determination. If you want your comments considered, please provide them to us within this period.

Comments by Date:	1 September 1999
Contact Officer:	Lila Soares
E-Mail address:	Lila.Soares@ato.gov.au
Telephone:	(02) 9354 3149
Facsimile:	(02) 9354 3379
Address:	Australian Taxation Office PO Box CC1 PARRAMATTA NSW 2123

TD 1999/D62

Page 4 of 4

FOI status: draft only - for comment

Commissioner of Taxation

4 August 1999

Subject references:

Asset; CGT asset; destruction; natural disaster; loss; reasonable; replacement asset; same; substantially the same

Legislative references:

ITAA 1997 124-85(3)(b), 124-95(6)(b)

ATO references:

NO 99/10859-2

BO CGT Involuntary Disposal summit 1999

ISSN: 1038 - 8982