

**CITY OF AIRDRIE
COMPOSITE ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD ORDER CARB 002-2025**

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT filed with the City of Airdrie Composite Assessment Review Board pursuant to Part 11 of the *Municipal Government Act*, c. M-26 RSA 2000 (“**MGA**”).

BETWEEN:

Ryan ULC for Synergy Airdrie Retail Ltd Partnership c/o Synergy Properties Ltd
Complainant

AND:

CITY OF AIRDRIE
Respondent

BEFORE:

Brenda Hisey, Presiding Officer
David Keagan, Member
Simi Obasan, Member

Secretariat:
Nikki Parkinson, Assessment Review Board Clerk

This is the decision of the City of Airdrie Composite Assessment Review Board [**Board**] in respect of property assessments prepared by the Assessor of the City of Airdrie and entered in the 2025 assessment roll as follows:

Roll No.	Municipal Address	Assessed value	Owner
735400	3 Stonegate Dr SW, Airdrie	\$23,397,000	Synergy Airdrie Retail Ltd Partnership c/o Synergy Properties Ltd

The complaint was heard on the 14th day of July, 2025, through a Teams meeting facilitated by the City of Airdrie.

BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY UNDER COMPLAINT

[1] The property (subject) under appeal is known as Dickson Crossing. It is located at 3 Stonegate Drive NW in Airdrie at a prominent corner along Highway 567 and Main Street North in the city's northwest quadrant. Directly to the east of the subject are two shadow anchors: Real Canadian Superstore and Canadian Tire. There are five buildings on the 4.51 acre site, all built in 2008.

[2] The assessment was calculated using the income approach to value for the five buildings:

- Building One at \$7,421,000 or \$441 per square foot (sf),
- Building Two at \$2,545,000 or \$413/sf,
- Building Three at \$4,324,000 or \$391/sf,
- Building Four at \$3,594,000 or \$588/sf, and
- Building Five at \$5,513,000 or \$449 /sf.

The total building is 52,437 sf with an average assessed value of \$446/sf and a total assessed value for the subject of \$23,397,000.

PRELIMINARY or PROCEDURAL MATTERS

[3] The parties requested carry over information be made between the subject property and a second parcel in the portfolio sale (roll number 8200, located at 804 Main Street SE) also under appeal. The Board agreed with this request.

ISSUE

[4] Is the assessment reflective of market value when considering the sale of the subject property?

COMPLAINANT'S POSITION

[5] In support of a reduction to the assessment, the Complainant presented the recent sale of the subject for \$18,170,000 (\$347/sf) on February 21, 2024. This market value transaction is less than the subject's assessment of \$23,397,000 (446/sf), which should be reduced to the sale price.

[6] The arms' length open market sale of the subject was described as part of a two-parcel portfolio transaction for \$22,350,000 with clear valuations assigned to both properties:

- roll number 8200, 804 Main Street SE for \$4,180,000 and
- roll number 735400 (the subject), 3 Stonegate Drive NW for \$18,170,000.

[7] The sale price for the subject was confirmed through an Affidavit re: Value of Land, sworn and registered at the Land Titles Office. The value was also reported by The Network – Real Estate Intelligence, a commercial sales data provider.

[8] In support of this position, the Complainant cited *697604 Alberta Ltd. v. Calgary (City of)*, 2005 AQBQ 512, where the court held that "a property's sale price is the best indicator of market value of that property."

[9] Additionally, a more recent court of appeal decision *Altus Group Ltd. v. Alberta (City of Edmonton Composite Assessment Review Board)*, 2023 ABCA 35 confirmed the obligation of municipalities to use mass appraisal techniques does not displace that goal of the assessment process: to establish market value. The sale of the subject should be reflective of market value.

[10] Several Composite Assessment Review Board and Municipal Government Board decisions were provided to support the position that the best indicator of market value is the sale of the subject itself.

RESPONDENT'S POSITION

[11] The current assessed value for the subject, determined in accordance with legislated mass appraisal standards with typical market data is reasonable, fair and equitable.

[12] To support the \$446/sf assessed value the Respondent provided four sales of similar retail strip properties. The properties had buildings that were constructed in 2003, 2004, 2004 and 2008, with sizes that ranged from 19,980 sf to 251,920 sf. The sale values for these comparables were \$283/sf, \$347/sf, \$410/sf and \$460/sf.

[13] The Respondent noted that although the subject was classified as a "good" property type, a sale from the "excellent" group (roll number 844320 located at 114 Sierra Springs Drive SE) at \$569/sf had similar tenants to the subject.

[14] The Respondent critiqued the offering process from the sale of the subject. No price was set with the listing, instead the vendor responded to expressions of interest from various parties. This method could have affected the marketability and the eventual sale price of the two portfolio properties, which was at the bottom end of the range of values and should not be considered the sole indicator of market value. Additionally, oral evidence was provided that suggested the owner was looking to divest their holdings.

[15] During questioning, the Respondent acknowledged there was no written documentation to support a mandated disbursement of assets and confirmed the sale of the subject was considered a valid sale used in the municipalities assessment model.

REBUTTAL

[16] The Complainant argued that when the post-facto sale from the Respondents comparables from November 2024 is excluded (consistent with established assessment principles), the sale price for the subject sits in the middle of the range.

[17] Furthermore, when the sale of the subject is removed from the Respondents comparable analysis the remaining two sales show an average price of \$346/sf. This supports the sale of the subject at \$347/sf.

DECISION

[18] The assessment is reduced to \$18,170,000.

REASONS

[19] The *Municipal Government Act*, RSA 2000, chapter M-26 section 1 (1)(n) defines market value as the price that would be paid for a property if it is sold in the open market by a willing seller to a willing buyer. Additionally, the *Matters Relating to Assessment and Taxation Regulation*, 2018, section 5 states that the assessment of property is based on market value.

[20] The subject sold for \$18,170,000 on February 21, 2024. The sale occurred less than 6 months from the valuation date that involved independent parties as vendor and purchaser for an arm's length, open market transaction. The sworn affidavit of value from Land Titles provides an accepted appropriation of the portfolio sale.

[21] The Board relies on the *697604 Alberta Ltd. V. Calgary (City of)*, 2005 ABQB 512 decision, where Justice Acton stated:

"I think generally speaking the recent sales price, if available as it was in this case, is in law and in common sense, the most realistic and most reliable method of establishing market value."

[22] The Board also relies on *Altus Group Ltd. V Alberta (City of Edmonton Composite Assessment Review Board)*, 2023 ABCA 35, which affirms that the principal goal of the assessment process is to determine an assessment reflective of market value. The obligation of municipalities to use mass appraisal techniques does not displace that ultimate goal of the assessment process: to establish market value, not average or typical value. While there may be a range of market values that could be justified, the aim is to determine market value for each property, not a range of values. The court went on to specify that where an actual timely sale of a property exists, then it is possible to set an exact market value.

[23] The Board finds the three comparables provided by the Respondent (excluding the post facto sale) support the value from the sale of the subject at \$347/sf.

[24] Several prior Composite Assessment Review Board decisions were provided by the Complainant to confirm that a recent sale of the subject is the most reliable indicator of market value.

[25] The Board accepts the recent arm's length, open market transaction to be the best indication of market value for the subject property. Although part of a portfolio sale, the value of both parcels within the transaction were accepted by the municipality as valid and were used in their assessment model.

Dated at the City of Airdrie, in the Province of Alberta, this²¹ day of July , 2025.

Brenda Hisey

dSign powered by Signority

Brenda Hisey
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.

APPENDIX "A"

DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AND CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD

NO.	ITEM
1. C-1	Complainant Disclosure – 334 pages
2. C-2	Complainant Rebuttal – 23 pages
3. R-1	Respondent Disclosure, Addenda, Legal Brief – 113 pages

APPENDIX “B”

ORAL REPRESENTATIONS

PERSON APPEARING	CAPACITY
------------------	----------

- | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Paul Chmeleski | Ryan ULC |
| 2. Byron Henderson | City of Airdrie Assessor |
| 3. Krista Paul | City of Airdrie Assessor |
| 4. Val Cottreau | City of Airdrie Assessor |

APPENDIX “C”

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITIES CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD

1. *Municipal Government Act*, Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, chapter 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.

2. *Matters Relating to Assessment Complaints Regulation*, Alberta Regulation 203/2017

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.