IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT filed with the Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo Local Assessment Review Board (LARB) pursuant to Part 11 of the *Municipal Government Act* being chapter M-26 of the revised statutes of Alberta 2000.

BETWEEN:

Saad Bachi – Complainant

\- and -

Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo (RMWB) – Respondent

BEFORE:

A. McKenzie, Presiding Officer
D. Cleaver, Member
S. Schaffer, Member

Staff:
A. Hawkins, Clerk

BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY UNDER COMPLAINT

[1] A hearing was convened on August 13, 2025, in the Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo in the Province of Alberta to consider a complaint about the assessment of the following property:

Assessment Roll Number	51001570
Civic Address	104 Ward Crescent, Fort McMurray, AB
Owner	Saad Bachi
File Number	ARB 25-038

[2] The subject property is a 2130 square feet (198 square meters) 2-storey home built in 2012, with an attached garage measuring 526 square feet (49 square meters). The property, located in the Parson's North neighbourhood in Fort McMurray, has 6 bedrooms, 4 full bathrooms, 1 two-piece bathroom, central air conditioning, a gas fireplace and a basement suite which has a separate entrance.

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

[3] The LARB derives its authority to make decision under Part 11 of the *Municipal Government Act*, R.S.A. 2000, c. M-26.

[4] The Presiding Officer noted that the Complainant was not present at the time the hearing was to commence. The Clerk confirmed that proper notice of the hearing had been provided to all parties. The Board delayed the start of the hearing by 30 minutes to provide an opportunity for the Complainant to participate. The hearing commenced with no representation from the Complainant as required by Section 463 of the *Municipal Government Act*.

> ***463*** *If any person who is given notice of the hearing does not attend, the assessment review board must proceed to deal with the complaint if*
> *(a) all persons required to be notified were given notice of the hearing, and*
> *(b) no request for a postponement or an adjournment was received by the board or, if a request was received, no postponement or adjournment was granted by the board.*

[5] The parties present confirmed that they had no objections to the composition of the Board.

[6] The Board confirmed it had no bias in relation to the matters.

[7] There were no preliminary matters.

ISSUES

Issue identified on the complaint form	Assessment Amount	Requested Value
An Assessment Amount	$609,530	$500,000

MERIT MATTERS

Position of the Complainant

[8] The Complainant provided a completed Assessment Review Board Complaint Form (Exhibit C-1).

[9] The Complainant stated on the Form that the "Assessment department compared the highest price not the average back to 2019".

[10] No further disclosure of evidence, either written or verbal, was provided or available to the Board to consider.

Position of the Respondent

[11] The Respondent provided an 18-page assessment disclosure package (Exhibit R-1) and a 58-page RMWB Law & Legislation Brief (Exhibit R-2).

[12] The Respondent confirmed that the subject property was assessed using Direct Sales Comparison approach to determine market value. This assessment approach estimates the value of the subject property as it existed on December 31, 2024, as if it has been sold in that condition on July 1, 2024, on the open market under typical market conditions between a willing buyer and a willing seller as mandated by the *Municipal Government Act*.

[13] The Respondent identified that the subject property, 104 Ward Crescent, is in the Parson's North neighbourhood of Fort McMurray. The 2-story home, built in 2012, is 2130 square feet (198 square metres) with an attached garage measuring 526 square feet (49 square meters). The property has 6 bedrooms, 4 full bathrooms, 1 two-piece bathroom, central air conditioning, a gas fireplace, and a basement suite that has a separate entrance.

[14] The Respondent submitted that although the Complainant has requested a revised assessed value, the Complainant has failed to submit any sales evidence to support a revised value. The onus is on the Complainant to provide data to support a request to revise an assessment

[15] The Respondent provided the following table comparing the subject property to three comparable properties within the same market area to defend the assessed value of the subject property. The adjusted sale price per square foot of the comparable properties ranges from $284 to $286, with the subject property being assessed at $286 per square foot (Exhibit R-1, Page 10).

	104 Ward Crescent (Subject Property)	768 Heritage Drive	100 Furber Street	676 Heritage Drive
House Size (sqft)	2,130	2,166	2,000	2,168
Lot Size (sqft)	4,290	5,454	4,346	4,822
Year Built	2012	2013	2014	2014
Garage Type	Attached	Attached	Detached	Attached
Garage Size (sqft)	526	612	396	569
Basement Suite	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bathrooms	4 full 1 half	3 full 1 half	4 full	3 full 1 half
Central Air	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fireplace	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sale Date	n/a	20-Dec-23	31-Aug-23	13-Sep-23
Sale Price	n/a	642,500	605,000	650,000
Time adj. Sale Price		620,390	571,360	617,300
Adj. Sale Price/sqft		$286	$285	$284
Subject Assessment 2025	609,530			
Subject Assessment/sqft	$286			

[16] The Respondent stated that the sales analysis of the three comparable sales conclude that the assessment of 104 Ward Crescent is within a reasonable prediction of value and is fair and equitable.

[17] The Respondent concluded that assessors are legislated with respect to valuation dates and are required to compare valid sales of similar properties to determine mass appraisal values based on those sales.

[18] The Respondent requested that the LARB confirm the assessment for the subject property at $609,530.

DECISION

[19] It is the Decision of the LARB to **CONFIRM** the assessment amount of $609,530.

REASON FOR DECISION

[20] The Board did not accept the statement from the Complainant that the "Assessment department compared the highest price not the average back to 2019". No evidence or submissions were provided to support, or to provide context to, this claim.

[21] The Board cannot accept the Complainant's request to reduce the assessment amount. There was no evidence or submission of any kind to support the request.

[22] The Board agreed with the Respondent that the onus is on the Complainant, and it is the Complainant's responsibility to provide evidence to support their complaint.

[23] The Board accepted the sales analysis provided by the Respondent and agreed that the subject property was assessed in a fair and equitable manner.

[24] In coming to its conclusion, the Board has reviewed carefully the provisions of the *Municipal Government Act* ("MGA"), the *Matters Relating to Assessment Complaints Regulation* ("MRAC") and the *Matters Relating to Assessment and Taxation Regulation* ("MRAT").

[25] It is so ordered.

DISSENTING OPINION

[26] There was no dissenting opinion.

[27] The decision of the Local Assessment Review Boards is final and binding on all parties. This decision may be judicially reviewed by the Court of King's Bench pursuant to Section 470(1) of the *Municipal Government Act, RSA 2000, c M-26.*

Dated at the Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo in the Province of Alberta, this 25th day of August, 2025.

Access to Information Act s 20(1)
[redacted]

A. McKenzie, Presiding Officer

APPENDIX A
DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AND CONSIDERED BY THE LARB

Exhibit Number	Description
C-1	ARB 25-038 Complaint Form (2 pages)
R-1	ARB 25-038 RMWB Disclosure (18 pages)
R-2	ARB 25-038 2025 RMWB Law Brief (58 pages)

APPENDIX B
REPRESENTATIONS

Person Appearing	Capacity
Dawn Robichaud	Assessor, Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo
Samson Ahensan	Assessor, Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo

APPENDIX C
LEGISLATION

Municipal Government Act, R.S.A. 2000, c. M-26.
Matters Relating to Assessment and Taxation Regulation, 2018 – AR 203/2017
Matters Relating to Assessment Complaints Regulation, 2018 – AR 201/2017