



CENTRAL ALBERTA REGIONAL
**Assessment
Review Board**

Complaint ID 0262 2089
Roll No. 30001913530

LOCAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD DECISION
HEARING DATE: JUNE 11, 2025

PRESIDING OFFICER: C. NEITZ
BOARD MEMBER: A. TARNOCZI
BOARD MEMBER: M. JAMES

BETWEEN:

Chris Hopp

Complainant

-and-

REVENUE AND ASSESSMENT SERVICES
For the City of Red Deer

Respondent

This decision pertains to a complaint submitted to the Central Alberta Regional Assessment Review Board in respect of a property assessment prepared by an Assessor of the City of Red Deer as follows:

ROLL NUMBER: 30001913530
MUNICIPAL ADDRESS: 27 Orchid Court Red Deer, AB
ASSESSMENT AMOUNT: \$762,100

The complaint was heard by the Local Assessment Review Board on the 11th day of June 2025, via video conferencing.

The Board derives its authority from the Municipal Government Act, R.S.A 2000, Chapter M-26 (the MGA) and related legislation as set out in Appendix "B".

Appeared on behalf of the Complainant: Chris Hopp

Appeared on behalf of the Respondent: Harmohit Singh and Travis Larder

DECISION: The assessed value of the subject property is confirmed at \$762,100.

JURISDICTION

- [1] The Central Alberta Regional Assessment Review Board [“the Board”] has been established in accordance with section 455 of the *Municipal Government Act*, RSA 2000, c M-26 [“MGA”].

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

- [2] The subject property is municipally located at 27 Orchid Court and is a 1 storey and basement. It is a semi custom built home that was constructed in 2008 featuring a developed basement, front attached garage, and partial upper floor area above a portion of the garage and house. The complainant stated the subject property was incorrectly classified as a bungalow and asked for a reduction of assessment to \$672,000.

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

- [3] The Presiding Officer confirmed that no Board Member raised any conflicts of interest with regard to matters before them.
- [4] Neither party raised any objection to the panel hearing the complaint.
- [5] The Respondent requested to exclude a portion of the Complainant’s disclosure, consisting of approximately 5 pages total, as it was only sent to the Respondent and not to the Board. The Respondent argued that the Complainant failed to disclose the material to the Board, as required under section 5(2)(a) of the *Matters Relating to Assessment Complaints Regulation*, AR 201/2017 [“MRAC”]. The Respondent received the disclosure package, but the Board did not. The Complainant initially sent the letter on May 19, 2025, but did not send it to the Board’s email address.
- [6] The Board confirmed they had received the Hearing Materials (21 pages), the Complainant Rebuttal Submission (8 pages) and the Respondent’s Submission (33 pages) but did not receive the initial Complainant Disclosure Submission (approximately 5 pages). The Board did not allow the initial Complainant Disclosure Submission to be admitted or considered, as the Board did not receive it according to MRAC s.5 (2)(a).

POSITION OF THE PARTIES**Position of the Complainant**

- [7] In the Assessment Review Board Complaint form, the Complainant presented that the subject property was incorrectly assessed as a 1 storey bungalow and stated it should be a 1 ½ storey home as the subject property has a partial 2nd storey above the garage. The Complainant asked for a reduced assessment to \$672,000.
- [8] The Complainant provided five comparable homes that are similar in square footage and lot size to the subject property (A1, pages 4-19).
- [9] The Complainant also stated the home next door was higher quality with larger square footage and larger lot size than subject property and was valued \$133,000 less.

-
- [10] The Complainant stated that their home had an inequitable valuation due to error on part of the Respondent, being the misclassification of the subject property as a bungalow in light of the upper floor area, believing same made the property a 1 ½ story.
- [11] The Complainant said the most comparable to the subject property was 7 Ashley Ave. It was a partial 2nd storey above garage with similar square footage and lot.
- [12] The Complainant alternatively requested if the subject property couldn't be classified as a 1 ½ story that it be considered a 2 storey.

Position of the Respondent

- [13] The Respondent stated that the current assessment value of \$762,100 is correct and confirmed that the assessment records are accurate.
- [14] The Respondent stated that a comprehensive exterior inspection of 27 Orchid Court was conducted by the assessor in 2024.
- [15] The Respondent brought forward the Assessment Summary showing the Market Land Valuation of 8,860 sq ft, Improvement Valuation 1 storey and basement 2,152 sq ft and attached garage 775 sq ft with assessment totals of subject property for 2024 of \$762,100.
- [16] The Respondent explained the use of the market modified cost approach that the City employs for valuation of residential properties plus valuation standards and time-adjusted sales.
- [17] The Respondent stated the Complainant used MLS based sale dates which differ from the sale dates the Assessor is required to use. The Respondent further explained that the City uses the Land Titles Office registration date as the official benchmark date. As it is the only verifiable and standardized record across all transactions.
- [18] The Respondent explained that the subject property has been correctly categorized in the assessment system as a bungalow with an upper area over the garage because there are no stairs to ascend or descend to access the main living area, the entire above-grade floor area exists on one primary level, and the bonus area above the garage is not a full second level.
- [19] The Respondent went onto clarify that the City's classification differs from real estate marketing terminology which often uses "1.5 storey" for exposure purposes. The City's classification system for 1 ½-storey homes is typically pre-1960 construction. 1 ¾ Storey houses typically have empty space at the gable ends. Bungalows with upper areas on the garage such as the subject property maintain full height wall throughout the main level with a bonus room or partial second-floor area above a garage, which does not constitute a full second storey or a 1 ½-storey design. The valuation model recognizes these structural nuances. The Respondent confirmed that these classification procedures and guidelines are applied consistently within the City.
- [20] The Respondent addressed the Complainants package, stating that it did not support a reduction in assessment as the structure had been correctly classified as a bungalow with upper area over the garage. The Complainant did not provide suitable comparable sales and the Respondent

applied an equitable valuation approach using comparable properties and remains confident that the assessed value of \$762,100 is correct.

- [21] The Respondent provided a Resales Analysis Table 2023-2024 (R1, page 14) to show consistent appreciation across multiple properties with average increase ranging from 13% to 23% annually stating the Complainant's 2015 purchase price of \$672,000 no longer reflects present day values.
- [22] The Respondent brought forward a Sale Comparable Table (R1, page 15) with 3 properties stating that the most comparable was Sale #1 - 128 Oakwood Close. This comparable was in the subject property's Oriole Park West neighbourhood. It has similar structure type, layout and finish quality. They said the subject property's assessment of \$762,100 was slightly higher as the subject property had a larger floor area and lot size.
- [23] The Respondent also verbally stated that if the subject property was changed to a 1 ½ storey or 2 story then the assessment would likely go higher as bonus rooms are valued different based on internal figures and industry standard costing manuals.
- [24] The Respondent maintained that the current assessed value of \$762,100 is fair and equitable, reflective of current market conditions, and consistent with comparable properties.

Position of the Complainant – Rebuttal

- [25] The Complainant disputed the Respondent's statement that the subject property didn't have stairs at the front entrance going up or down to access the main living area. The Complainant pointed out that the home has five stairs on the exterior leading up to the front door.
- [26] The Complainant brought forward photos to dispute the Respondent's statement that the entire above grade floor area exists on one primary level. The photos show that there are stairs going up to the 2nd story and down to the basement. The Complainant stated that 2-stair designs are common in homes that have both a 2nd story and a basement.
- [27] The Complainant brought forward floor plans to show the 2nd story is not fully over the garage footprint (C1, page 3).
- [28] The Complainant submitted a front profile of the home (C1, page 5), showing the single slope of the roof. The Complainant pointed out the vented area to the left of the outlined second story, indicating unusable space. In the Complainant's opinion, the builders intentionally chose not to extend the second story over the entire garage to create more usable wall space. As a result, the wall height is approximately 7 feet rather than the typical 4-foot pony wall. The Complainant further stated that in his opinion, if the design had included a gable roof, it would have resulted in additional unusable space on the opposite side.
- [29] The Complainant provided photos (C1, page 5-6) to show that their house met the requirements of the respondent's definition of a 1.5 story showing walls heights that are not consistently maintained as claimed by the respondent and floor plan #1 showed that the 2nd story is not only more than just what might be a mere bonus room.
- [30] The Complainant's final request to the Board would be one of the 3 outcomes:

1. Requested the Respondent perform a manual valuation of the subject home with its correct classification as a 1.5 storey home.
2. Or reclassify the home as a 2 storey.
3. If the home is not classified into a 1.5 or 2 storey then the valuation should just be based on the 1st storey home's square footage (1614 sq. ft.) and compare it against other bungalows in the area.


BOARD FINDINGS and DECISION

- [31] In review of the materials and submissions from the Complainant and the Respondent, the Board acknowledged that the Complainant's main complaint according to assessment value was structure type clarification of bungalow versus 1 ½ storey or 2 story.
- [32] The Board found the Complainant's best comparable is a 2 storey and the Respondent's best comparable is a bungalow. Nothing was provided to support a 1 ½ storey as a comparable by either the Complainant or Respondent.
- [33] The Board found the Respondent's definition of bungalow stated upper and bonus areas are largely above garage, with some portion over house. The subject property's configuration does not follow traditional 1 ½ storey configurations.
- [34] The Board noted the Complainant provided partial floor plans showing the upper level superimposed over the main level of the subject property and the Respondent pointed out whole home floor plan was not provided and lacked visual to see exactly where the upper area was in conjunction with the whole floor plan.
- [35] The Board acknowledges that the Complainant's final three recommendations regarding property classification fall outside the Board's jurisdiction. The Board's authority is limited to the scope defined by the *MGA* and the *MRAT*. Upon reviewing the Assessment Review Board Complaint Form, the Board noted that the Complainant selected only Box 3, which pertains specifically to the assessment amount.
- [36] The Board acknowledges that the Complainant brought forward the best hybrid comparable on 7 Ashley Avenue and other comparables (A1, pages 4-19), but there was no evidence to show assessment or assessor's classification. The Board gave little weight to these comparisons.
- [37] The Ratio Study of Comparable Properties charts (R1, page 13) provided by the Respondent compares the Assessment to Sale Ratios of 22 comparable bungalows (Chart A) and 6 comparable bungalows with an upper level over the garage (Chart B). The Assessment-to-Sale Ratio of both charts is 0.98, which falls within the MRAT-compliant range of 0.95 and 1.05. The Board gave the most weight to this evidence, and it was the best evidence brought forward by the Respondent.
- [38] After reviewing evidence submitted from the Respondent and Complainant the Board confirms no change is necessary or warranted on the evidence before it.

DECISION SUMMARY

[39] The assessed value of the subject property is confirmed at \$762,100.

[40] Dated at the Central Alberta Regional Assessment Review Board, in the city of Red Deer, in the Province of Alberta this 11th day of July 2025 and signed by the Presiding Officer on behalf of all the panel members who agree that the content of this document adequately reflects the hearing, deliberations and decision of the Board.



C. Neitz
Presiding Officer

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.

MGA 470(1) Where a decision of an assessment review board is the subject of an application for judicial review, the application must be filed with the Court of King's Bench and served not more than 60 days after the date of the decision.

(2) *Notice of an application for judicial review must be given to*

- (a) the assessment review board that made the decision,*
- (b) the complainant, other than an applicant for the judicial review,*
- (c) an assessed person who is directly affected by the decision, other than the complainant,*
- (d) a municipality, if the decision that is the subject of the judicial review relates to property that is within the boundaries of that municipality, and*
- (e) the Minister.*

Additional information may also be found at www.albertacourts.ab.ca.

APPENDIX "A"DOCUMENTS PRESENTED AT THE HEARING
AND CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD:

<u>EXHIBIT NO.</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
A.1	Hearing Materials	21
C.2	Complainant Rebuttal	8
R.1	Respondent Submissions	33

APPENDIX "B"**LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITIES CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD:*****Municipal Government Act, R.S.A. 2000, Chapter M-26 (the MGA)*****Interpretation**

s 1(1)(n) In this Act,

- (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;

Assessments for property other than designated industrial property

s 289(2) Each assessment must reflect

- (a) the characteristics and physical condition of the property on December 31 of the year prior to the year in which a tax is imposed under Part 10 in respect of the property, and
- (b) the valuation and other standards set out in the regulations for that property.

Joint establishment of assessment review boards

s.455(1) Two or more councils may agree to jointly establish the local assessment review board or the composite assessment review board, or both, to have jurisdiction in their municipalities.

Jurisdiction of assessment review boards

s.460.1(1) A local assessment review board has jurisdiction to hear complaints about any matter referred to in section 460(5) that is shown on

- (a) an assessment notice for
- (i) residential property with 3 or fewer dwelling units, or
- (ii) farm land

s.460.1(2) Subject to section 460(14) and (15), a composite assessment review board has jurisdiction to hear complaints about

- (a) any matter referred to in section 460(5) that is shown on
- (i) an assessment notice for property other than property described in subsection (1)(a)

Decisions of assessment review board

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.

- (1.1)** For greater certainty, the power to make a change under subsection (1) includes the power to increase or decrease an assessed value shown on an assessment roll or tax roll.

- (2) An assessment review board must dismiss a complaint that was not made within the proper time or that does not comply with section 460(9).
- (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.
- (4) An assessment review board must not alter any assessment of farm land, machinery and equipment or railway property that has been prepared correctly in accordance with the regulations.

Matters Relating to Assessment and Taxation Regulation, 2018 A.R. 2003/2017 (MRAT)

Mass Appraisal

- s. 5 An assessment of property based on market value
- (a) must be prepared using mass appraisal
 - (b) must be an estimate of the value of the fee simple estate in the property, and
 - (c) must reflect typical market conditions for properties similar to that property.

Valuation Date

- s. 6 Any assessment prepared in accordance with the Act must be an estimate of the value of a property on July 1 of the assessment year.

Valuation standard for a parcel of land

- s. 7(1) The valuation standard for a parcel of land is
- (a) market value, or
 - (b) if the parcel is used for farming operations, agricultural use value.

Valuation standard for a parcel and improvements

- s. 9(1) When an assessor is preparing an assessment for a parcel of land and the improvements to it, the valuation standard for the land and improvements is market value unless subsection (2) or (3) applies.

Matters Relating to Assessment Complaints Regulation, AR 201/2017 (MRAC)

Disclosure of evidence

- s. 5(1) In this section, “complainant” includes an assessed person or taxpayer who is affected by a complaint who wishes to be heard at the hearing.
- (2) If a complaint is to be heard by a local assessment review board panel, the following rules apply with respect to the disclosure of evidence:
- (a) the complainant must, at least 21 days before the hearing date,
 - (i) disclose to the respondent and the local assessment review board the documentary evidence, a summary of the testimonial evidence, including

- any signed witness reports, and any written argument that the complainant intends to present at the hearing in sufficient detail to allow the respondent to respond to or rebut the evidence at the hearing, and
- (ii) provide to the respondent and the local assessment review board an estimate of the amount of time necessary to present the complainant's evidence

Personal Attendance not required

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