

IN THE MATTER OF A COMPLAINT filed with the Town of Okotoks Local Assessment Review Board (LARB) pursuant to the *Municipal Government Act (MGA)*, Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, Chapter M-26, Section 460.

BETWEEN:

Nathan Adam Wanvig - Complainant

- and -

The Town of Okotoks - Respondent

BEFORE:

Laura Dunbar-Proctor, Presiding Officer

Rene Pohl, Member

Andre Ulloa, Member

This is a complaint to the Town of Okotoks Local Assessment Review Board (LARB) in respect of a property assessment prepared by the Assessor of the Town of Okotoks and entered in the 2024 Assessment Roll as follows:

Roll Number	Address	Assessment
0114340	31 Banded Peak View	\$1,189,000

This complaint was heard on the 18th day of June 2025 at the Town of Okotoks Municipal Centre Council Chamber at 5 Elizabeth Street, Okotoks, Alberta.

Appearing on behalf of the Complainant:

- Nathan Adam Wanvig

Appearing on behalf of the Respondent:

- Nathan Hanberry, Assessor

Attending for the Assessment Review Board (ARB):

- Olga Kanevskyi, Clerk

OKOTOKS LOCAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD ORDER #0238/16/2025-L

Preliminary Matters

[1] No preliminary matters were raised by either party.

Property Description and Background

[2] The subject property is located at 31 Banded Peak View in Okotoks, AB and is a residential two-storey home with an undeveloped walkout basement and an attached garage. The improved area on record is 2,634 SF and the land area is 6,757 SF. The year of construction is 2021. It is currently assessed by The Town of Okotoks at \$1,189,000, but the Assessor recommended at the hearing that the Board reduce it to \$1,037,000. The requested value on the assessment complaint form is \$985,000.

Issues

[3] Is the subject being assessed too high because it is being grouped in the model with superior properties?

Board's Findings in Respect of Each Matter or Issue

[4] The Board reduces the assessment to the time-adjusted sale price of \$1,009,000.

Summary of Positions

Complainant:

[5] The Complainant noted on their initial complaint form that their property was being incorrectly assessed by being grouped with bungalow estate homes in the area. They argued that these homes were more desirable than the subject, due to the bungalow structure type, the triple car garages, and finished walkout basements. In contrast, the subject is a two-storey structure, with double garage and an unfinished walkout basement.

[6] The Complainant argued that their property assessment has been an ongoing issue since they took possession in November 2021, and that they have appealed three times. Previous Boards have determined that they were being assessed too high and reduced the assessment accordingly. In 2024, The Town agreed to lower the assessed value by \$200,000, rather than appear before the Board.

[7] The Complainant supported their requested value by including MLS listing evidence of 63 sales of two-storey properties in Okotoks. All occurred in 2024, and all were homes on the north side of the river, like the subject. They also filtered for sales of homes with a walkout

OKOTOKS LOCAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD ORDER #0238/16/2025-L

basement, a double attached garage, and between 2,000 - 2,800 SF in living area. Sale prices ranged from \$581,000 to \$979,900.

[8] Of the 63 sales, the Complainant indicated that the three properties most similar to the subject to be 43 Birch Glen (sold for \$979,900 in February 2024), 41 Banded Peak View (sold for \$810,000 in March 2024) and 10 Highwood Drive (sold for \$930,000 in July 2024). When questioned as to why their requested value was higher than the comparable sale prices, they advised that they back on to a green space and have a view of the river valley.

[9] Of the sales comparables provided by the Respondent, the Complainant indicated that 59 Mist Mountain Rise was the most similar to the subject, as it has the same river valley view.

[10] During presentation of rebuttal, the Complainant requested to be assessed at \$989,000 like 10 Banded Peak View. This property does not have a walkout or back on to the green space but is larger and has a finished basement.

Respondent:

[11] The Respondent provided a property summary and included a photo and map of the subject property. The Respondent reviewed the approaches to value and mass appraisal method for preparing property assessments as required by the *Municipal Government Act*.

[12] Five sales comparables were provided of nearby two-storey properties that sold between March 2022 to March 2023. The sales comparables were shown to share similar characteristics to the subject property in terms of size, age, and structure type. Only 51 Banded Peak View had an unfinished walkout basement like the subject. The rest had finished basements but were not walkouts. Lot sizes ranged from 4,668 SF to 5,749 SF as compared with the subject property's 6,757 SF lot. The time-adjusted sale prices ranged from \$919,100 to \$1,067,200. The time-adjusted sale price of the subject property is \$1,009,000, falling within the same range.

[13] The Respondent confirmed that the subject property is currently being over assessed because it is being stratified in the model with two-storey homes in the estate area of Cimarron, which typically sell between \$200,000 to \$300,000 more than other two-storeys. They recommended that the assessed value for the subject property be changed to \$1,037,000, which would result in an assessment to sale ratio (ASR) of 1.03, meaning that the assessment would be within 3% of the time-adjusted sale price. They were not able to clarify which sales they used to determine the recommended value.

[14] The Respondent spoke to the sales evidence submitted by the Complainant, noting that 44 out of the 63 sales occurred after the July 1, 2024 valuation date, and were not used in the model. They also noted that the sale of 41 Banded Peak View was not used because permits for

OKOTOKS LOCAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD ORDER #0238/16/2025-L

significant work were taken out after the sale.

Findings and Reasons

[15] Each assessment year is considered independently. While decisions from prior years may offer some guidance, they are not binding on future Boards, who must base their decisions on the evidence presented for the year under complaint. In this case, the Board notes that no prior Board decisions have been submitted as evidence, and therefore the specific reasons for any reductions are unknown. However, the fact that this is an ongoing issue, over multiple years, is of concern. The Board would recommend that both parties have a conversation in the fall when values for 2026 are being finalized to ensure that the subject property is being correctly stratified going forward.

[16] The Board was not persuaded by the Respondent's recommended value of \$1,037,000, as it was not clear what this was based on, and no sales were presented that would directly support this value.


[17] The Board was most persuaded by the \$1,009,000 time-adjusted sale price of the subject property, especially when comparing it with other sales. The subject was similar to 10 Banded Peak View but ultimately was deemed superior due to the green space and the river valley view and therefore should be assessed higher than this comparable. The subject was also deemed superior to the Complainant's three best comparables, including 41 Banded Peak View. The Complainant's requested value was much higher than any of the sale prices for these otherwise similar homes, suggesting that there is significant value in the subject's river valley view. This is supported with the \$1,067,200 time-adjusted sale price of 59 Mist Mountain Rise, which is the only other comparable in evidence that backs on to the same ridge and has the same view as the subject property.

Board's Decision

[18] The Board reduces the assessment to \$1,009,000.

It is so ordered.

Dated at the Town of Okotoks in the Province of Alberta this 26th day of June 2025.



Laura Dunbar-Proctor
Presiding Officer

OKOTOKS LOCAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD ORDER #0238/16/2025-L

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

NO.	ITEM
C-1	Complaint Form (1 page)
C-2	Complainant's Disclosure Email (6 pages) Complainant's Disclosure Attachments (63 files)
R-1	Respondent's Disclosure (12 pages)
C-3	Complainant's Rebuttal (2 pages)

An application for Judicial Review may be made to the Court of King's Bench with respect to a decision of an assessment review board.

An application for Judicial Review must be filed with the Court of King's Bench and served not more than 60 days after the date of the decision, and notice of the application must be given to

- (a) the assessment review board*
- (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) the municipality, and*
- (e) the Minister.*