Complaint ID 0262 2223
Roll No. 30002910040

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

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

BETWEEN:

JEB2 Properties Inc.
(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:	30002910040
MUNICIPAL ADDRESS:	6842 50 Avenue, Red Deer, Alberta
ASSESSMENT AMOUNT:	$4,398,500

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 1.19 acres on the north end of the municipality. It was constructed in 1997 with one structure of 16,037 square feet of development. Currently there a total of nine commercial retail units (CRU).

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

[3] The Presiding Officer confirmed that no Board Member raised any conflicts of interest regarding matters before them.

[4] Neither party raised any objection to the panel hearing the complaint.

[5] The Respondent requested that page 44 of their R.1 be excluded from the public record because the information contained within could reasonably be expected to disclose intimate personal, financial or commercial matters, and the confidentiality of the information outweighs the public interest of disclosing the information. The Board accepted the request.

[6] 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

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

[8] The Complainant explained that the subject property rental rate for CRU space is incorrect and that a market rental rate of $18.00 per square foot is well supported by leasing evidence from comparable CRU spaces in the surrounding market area.

[9] The Complainant included an analysis of twelve leases from nine properties. The properties show a year of construction range of 1978 to 2007, with areas of 1,013 to 2,864 square feet. The lease rates were from $15 to $29 per square foot. The median is $18, the mean is $18.33, and the weighted mean is $18.88 per square foot.

[10] When adding in the subject property leases, the sample has seventeen leases from ten properties, not changing the ranges of age, area or lease rates. The new median is $18, mean is $19.53 and the weighted mean is $19.52 per square foot versus the $21 per square foot assessed rental rate.

[11] The Complainant included a decision from the Board on the subject property wherein the Board accepted a similar request in Complaint ID 0262 2087.

[12] The Complainant argued that its analyses indicate that the CRU rental value is $18.00 per square foot. The requested assessment is $3,738,400.

[13] In Rebuttal, the Complainant explained that the Respondent's three-year Quality 27 lease rate analysis presents twelve leases as independent market evidence supporting a median rate of $24.00 per square foot and an average of $23.19 per square foot, against which the Respondent describes its applied $21.00 per square foot rate as conservative. Five of the twelve leases are subject property leases or 42 percent of the sample. A market study intended to test whether the subject property's rents align with the market cannot rely, in substantial part, on the subject property's own rents to prove the point. Removing subject property entries, the remaining seven range from $15 to $32 per square foot.

[14] The Respondent's lease rate tables; list area, lease start date, and rate for each comparable, but do not include the year of construction. Matching leased area against the Respondent's own income reports indicate a year of construction range between 2009, and 1982 - spanning twenty-seven years, with the subject property at 1997 build date falling between them. The stratification narrative described this cohort as sharing a common vintage and effective age of the 1990s. The Board should weigh the age range against the “1990s vintage” description offered as the basis for treating these leases as comparable to the Subject.

[15] In summation, the Complainant submitted that its comparables remain unrebutted on their individual merits and should be preferred to the Respondent’s that is, substantially, the Subject property's own leasing history, and requested the Board to accept the leases with a median of $18 per square foot and change the assessment to $3,738,400.

Position of the Respondent

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

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

[18] The Respondent summarized that the Complainant raised the issue of whether the CRU space at the subject property should be assessed at $18.00 per square foot instead of the $21 per square foot assessed. The Complainant’s position is that its comparable property leases are better evidence and represent the best evidence for the subject property.

[19] The Respondent argued that there are twelve comparable leases in six properties including the subject property, indicating that there are comparable quality properties that show that CRU spaces 750 to 4,582 square feet with a quality 27 in strip malls have a range of $15 to $31 per square foot. The median is $24 and the average is $23.19 per square foot, with both results supporting the $21 per square foot assessed rate. This was a 3-year analysis. If you shorten it to a one-year analysis the median becomes $21.50 and if you add in the south Red Deer market (quality 7) over a one-year period, you get a median of $21, and an average of $21.32 per square foot, all supporting the $21 per square foot assessed rate.

[20] The five leases in the subject property (not factoring in a step-up), indicate a range of $18 to $25 per square foot, and an average of $22.40 and a median of $23 per square foot.

[21] 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

[22] 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 for comparable quality properties.

[23] The Complainant focused on one attribute (year of construction) and failed to show how all the attributes of quality were considered in arriving at its comparable list. The subject property is in a desirable north-end location with good access and exposure. The subject property was built in 1997, and the Respondent provided five additional comparable properties that have similar quality, exposure to major traffic corridors, and size of CRU space.

DECISION SUMMARY

[24] The Board finds that the original assessed value is Confirmed at $4,398,500.

[25] 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	264
C.2	Complainant Rebuttal	42
R.1	Respondent Submissions	70 pages excluding page 44 (sealed in accordance with Board Decision)
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.