CENTRAL ALBERTA REGIONAL Assessment ReviewBoard

Complaint ID 0262 2200
Roll No. 30000931311

COMPOSITE ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD DECISION
HEARING DATE: July 13, 2026

PRESIDING OFFICER: J. Dawson
BOARD MEMBER: T. Handley
BOARD MEMBER: D. Wielinga

BETWEEN:

Peacock Developments Ltd.
(as represented by Ryan ULC)

Complainant

-and-

Assessment Unit
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:	30000931311
MUNICIPAL ADDRESS:	3321 50 Avenue, Red Deer, Alberta
ASSESSMENT AMOUNT:	$2,540,400

The complaint was heard by the Composite Assessment Review Board on the 13th day of July 2026, 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: B. Robinson, Agent, RYAN ULC

Appeared on behalf of the Respondent: S. Gill, Senior Assessor, City of Red Deer
T. Johnson, Assessment Coordinator, City of Red Deer

DECISION: The assessed value of the subject property requires No Change.

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 a Retail Strip Centre with a C-4 Commercial land use designation. It occupies 0.50 acres on the south end of the municipality. It was constructed in 2022 with one structure of 5,738 square feet of development. Currently there a total of five commercial retail units (CRU), four are quick service restaurants, and one is a quick service space with a drive through.

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] No additional preliminary or procedural matters were raised by any party. Both parties indicated that they were prepared to proceed with the complaints.

POSITION OF THE PARTIES

Position of the Complainant

[6] The Complainant presented the details of the subject property through assessment records, aerial, and street level photographs.

[7] The Complainant explained that the subject property has sufficient leasing activity to establish the market value with a typical CRU space rental rate of $28.50 and a drive through CRU rental rate of $35 per square foot.

[8] The four CRU rental spaces show a range of $27.50 to $32.50 per square foot with a median of $28.50 per square foot.

[9] An additional analysis was provided for the drive through spaces with seven records (including the subject property lease). The range was $32 to $40 per square foot arriving a median of $33.27 per square foot.

[10] The Complainant included a decision from the Board on the subject property wherein the Board accepted a similar request. Complaint ID 0262 2073 applies to show that the Board accepted the subject property leasing information for the drive through and used the subject property leases with other leases to set the CRU rental rate.

[11] The Complainant argued that its analysis indicates that the CRU rental value is $28.50 per square foot and for drive through space is $35.00 per square foot. The requested assessment is $2,372,500.

[12] In Rebuttal, the Complainant explained that one of the five source buildings behind the Respondent's study, “Property A”, has CRU space more than double the size of the subject property CRU spaces. Additionally, the subject property represents four of the fourteen spaces, and three of those leases are on the low end of the sample and indicate that they may not be well-matched comparable properties.

[13] In summation, the Complainant requested the Board to follow the 2025 decision and accept the leases within the subject property and change the assessment to $2,372,500.

Position of the Respondent

[14] The Respondent reviewed the subject property details with assessment details, aerial, and street level photography.

[15] Then the Respondent presented the valuation methodology including the income approach, cost approach, and discussed the market versus process with the role of mass appraisal.

[16] The Respondent summarized that the Complainant raised the issue of whether the CRU space at the subject property should be assessed at $28.50 per square foot instead of the $30 per square foot assessed and the drive through CRU space $35 versus the $37 per square foot assessed rate. The Complainant’s position is that the subject property leases are within the analyses period and represent the best evidence for the subject property.

[17] The Respondent argued that there are comparable properties to the subject property, indicating that there are comparable quality properties and presented a 3-year lease analysis with fourteen leases from five buildings that show that CRU spaces 988 to 2,598 square feet CRU spaces with a quality 10 or 30 in strip malls have a range of $27.50 to $36.43 per square foot. The median is $30.50 and the average is $30.99 per square foot, with both results supporting the $30 per square foot assessed rate. Furthermore, if you remove three of the larger CRU spaces and focus on 988 to 1,200 square feet CRU spaces, the results still support $30 per square foot.

[18] The drive through CRU rental rate requested is $35 per square foot when the comparable properties demonstrate $37 per square foot assessment. Five leases were presented from five properties indicate a range of $35 to $44 per square foot with a median of $38 and an average of $39.40 per square foot in support of the $37 per square foot assessed rate. Even adding two neighbourhood shopping centre spaces, as provided by the Complainant, the range lowers to $32 to $44 per square foot, the median is $37 and the average is $37.29 per square foot, which still supports the assessment.

[19] The Respondent concluded that the subject property has been shown to be assessed correctly and the assessment is fair and equitable, asking for the Board to confirm the assessment.

BOARD FINDINGS and DECISION

[20] The Board finds that, while the subject property offers an indication of market value, it does not serve as the only evidence of market value. The Board may rely solely on the actual leases in place to determine the market value assessment only in rare circumstances.

[21] The Board reviewed the evidence provided by both parties, and on the balance of probabilities, finds that the comparables forwarded by the Respondent more closely resembled the current market rental rates to create the subject property assessment. The subject property was built in 2022 on a major traffic route, and the Respondent provided four additional comparable properties built in 2020 or newer that have similar quality, and exposure to major traffic corridors, and size of CRU space. Meanwhile, the Complainant advanced the subject property only suggesting that the Respondent had not well-matched comparable properties. The Board disagrees and finds that the comparable properties selected by the Respondent with similar size spaces, represent the typical market value.

DECISION SUMMARY

[22] The Board finds that the original assessed value is Confirmed at $2,540,400.

[23] Dated at the Central Alberta Regional Assessment Review Board, in the city of Red Deer, in the Province of Alberta this 10th day of August, 2026 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.

J. Dawson
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:

EXHIBIT NO.	ITEM	PAGES
A.1	Hearing Materials	23
C.1	Complainant Submissions	191
C.2	Complainant Rebuttal	33
R.1	Respondent Submissions	68
R.2	Respondent Legal Brief	68

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) applies.