



Board Order 2026-013

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

BETWEEN:

McCoy Investments, as represented by owner Brad McCoy – Complainant

- and -

Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo (RMWB) – Respondent

BEFORE:

Members:

J. Jones, Presiding Officer, Land & Property Rights Tribunal (LPRT)

S. Schaffer, Assessment Review Board Member

S. Yasin-Mughal, Assessment Review Board Member

Staff:

A. Hawkins, Clerk, RMWB

BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY UNDER COMPLAINT

[1] A hearing was convened on September 10, 2026, 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	71006590
Assessment Amount	\$2,755,380
Civic Address	9911 MacDonald Avenue Fort McMurray, AB
Owner	McCoy Investments
File Number	ARB 26-041

[2] The subject property is assessed as an office building with an effective year built of 1979 and a total leasable area of 28,217 square feet (sf), of which 8,391 sf is main floor space. Utilizing the income approach to valuation, typical market income and expense rates

were applied to derive a net operating income, which was capitalized at 9% to derive an assessed value of \$2,755,380.

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

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

[3] The party present confirmed that there were no objections to the composition of the Board, and the Board confirmed it had no bias in relation to this property.

[4] The hearing was conducted via video conference.

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

[5] The Complainant did not attend the virtual hearing. The Clerk contacted him via telephone, and he indicated he thought that the assessment had been revised as outlined in the Respondent's disclosure submission and there was no need to attend.

[6] The hearing proceeded in the Complainant's absence as per the *Matters Relating to Assessment Complaints Regulation s (19)* with the Board considering the disclosure submission that accompanied the complaint form.

ISSUE

[7] Is the assessment of the subject property at \$2,755,380 equitable and reflective of market value as of the valuation date of July 1, 2025.

MERIT MATTERS

Position of the Complainant

[8] In support of a requested reduction of the subject's assessment to \$1,600,000, the Complainant referenced the recent sale of the subject at \$1.675,000 as well as an appraisal which valued the subject at \$2,050,000.

[9] Problems experienced by the subject such as long-term vacancy and a Building Deficiency Report which valued deficiencies at \$280,675, need to be considered with respect to the lack of income and values that would be deducted by a potential purchaser.

[10] The subject's assessment history was also referenced, noting significant reductions in the 2024 and 2025 assessments, demonstrating an inconsistency in the assessments.

Position of the Respondent

[11] The Respondent outlined the mass appraisal methodology employed by the RMWB in which properties are stratified into comparable groups, common characteristics are identified, and a valuation model is created for each group.

[12] For the subject's property type, the income approach to valuation is utilized which relies on obtaining typical market data through an annual request for information process in which property owners report income and expense data.

[13] Legislation requires market value assessments to be based on the fee simple estate of a property as of the valuation date of July 1, 2025, and a condition date of December 31, 2025, which requires the application of typical market income and expense values.

[14] The Respondent advised that there was a recommendation to reduce the subject's assessment from \$2,755,380 to \$2,157,440 based on a review of the assessment following the receipt of the complaint. The revision was based on removing the basement space from the rentable space. The regional market has a sufficient supply of above-grade office space and the subject's basement space is unrentable given its condition and as a result contributes no value to the property.

[15] With respect to the sale of the subject property, it was noted that the sale in May 2026 is post-facto (after the July 1, 2025 valuation date) and outside the three-year sales window (July 1, 2022- June 30, 2025) used for the 2026 assessments. The appraisal referenced by the Complainant was not included in the Complainant's disclosure.

[16] With respect to the vacancy experienced by the subject property, the Respondent noted that a chronic vacancy allowance of 30% has been applied in the assessment to account for vacancy and recoverable expense losses.

[17] With respect to the reported building deficiencies, the Respondent noted that an annual 5% structural allowance reduction is applied in the assessment to account for these types of repairs.

[18] With respect to previous assessments of the subject property, the Respondent noted that each year's assessment is independent of previous years as assessments are

required by legislation to be prepared annually based on typical market conditions as of the current valuation date.

[19] Even though the assessed lease rates were not disputed by the Complainant, the Respondent provided market support from five properties located in the same market area as the subject as well as equity support from four properties also located in the same market area.

[20] In summary, the Respondent recommended that the subject's assessment be reduced to \$2,157,440 as referenced above.

DECISION

[21] **The decision of the Board to reduce the assessment of the subject property from \$2,755,380 to \$2,157,440 as recommended by the Respondent.**

REASON FOR DECISION

[22] The Board found that the sale of the subject property in May 2026 was significantly post-facto and not an indication of market value as of the assessment valuation date of July 1, 2025. In addition, the appraisal referenced by the Complainant was not provided for review by either the Respondent or the Board.

[23] The Board also found that the Complainant's concerns regarding vacancy and repairs had adequately been addressed in the assessment through the application of chronic vacancy and structural allowance expense deductions.

[24] With respect to past assessments and revisions, the Board noted that each year's assessment is independent and based on typical market conditions as of the current valuation date.

[25] Even though they had not been challenged by the Complainant, the Board found that the market and equity comparables provided by the Respondent supported the assessed lease rates for the subject property.

[26] The Board found the Respondent's recommended revision to the subject's valuation based on eliminating the basement space as potentially leasable to be reasonable, considering its condition and competing above-grade space in the same market area. As a result, the Board accepted the Respondent's recommendation to revise the subject's

assessment to \$2,157,440.

[27] The Board found the subject's revised assessment to be equitable and reflective of market value as of the valuation date of July 1, 2025.

[28] In coming to its conclusion, the Board reviewed 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").

[29] The decision of the Composite Assessment Review Board is final and binding on all parties, subject only to appeal to the Court of King's Bench on a question of law or jurisdiction with respect to the decision in accordance with section 470 of the *Municipal Government Act*, R.S.A 2000, c. M-26.

Dated at the Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo, in the Province of Alberta, this 29 day of September, 2026.

ATIA s.20(1)

J. Jones, Presiding Officer, LPRT

APPENDIX A

DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AND CONSIDERED BY THE CARB

Exhibit Number	Description
C1	Complaint form & attachments (131 pages)
R2	Respondent's Assessment Brief (36 pages)
R3	Land Use Bylaw No. 99/059 (500 pages)
R4	Law & Legislation (58 pages)

APPENDIX B

REPRESENTATIONS

Person Appearing	Capacity
Scott Kim	Assessor, RMWB

APPENDIX C

LEGISLATION

Municipal Government Act, RSA 2000, c M-26

s 1(1)(n) “market value” means the amount that a property, as defined in section 284(1)(r), might be expected to realize if it is sold on the open market by a willing seller to a willing buyer;

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.

Matters Relating to Assessment Complaints Regulation, 2018, AR 201/2017

s 19(1) Parties to a hearing before a panel of an assessment review board may attend the hearing in person or may, instead of attending in person, file a written presentation with the clerk.