Complaint ID 0262 2228
Roll No. 30002941766

COMPOSITE ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD DECISION
HEARING DATE: July 14, 2026

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

BETWEEN:

2229862 Alberta 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:	30002941766
MUNICIPAL ADDRESS:	7414 50 Avenue, Red Deer, Alberta
ASSESSMENT AMOUNT:	$7,830,300

The complaint was heard by the Composite Assessment Review Board on the 14th 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: A. Sivalingam, 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 3.51 acres on the north end of the municipality. It was constructed in 2021 and has three structures 18,675 square feet of development. Of the 3.51 acres, 0.65 acres are considered surplus and will eventually be developed for an additional 12,000 square feet of rentable space. Currently there is a gas bar, carwash, convenience store, a freestanding quick service restaurant, and a space with five commercial retail units (CRU).

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 that page 43 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 provided an analysis of CRU rental space rates near the subject property. The twelve comparable leases ranged in size from 1,018 to 2,864 square feet. The year of construction was provided between 1978 and 2007, and the lease start dates are from July 1, 2023, to November 8, 2024. The rental values range from $15 to $29 per square foot, with a median of $18.00, a mean of $18.33, and a weighted mean of $18.88 per square foot.

[9] The Complainant included an additional analysis of CRU within the municipality containing 17 records. The comparable leases ranged in size between 650 to 5,034 square feet. The year of construction was not provided, and the lease start dates are from January 1, 2023, to January 1, 2026. The rental values range from $13 to $61.17 per square foot finding a median of $23.00, and a mean of $24.50 per square foot.

[10] The rent roll for 2022 of the subject property was provided, showing two CRU tenants in four spaces identified. Two spaces are identified as vacant, and the two rented spaces were 1500 and 2200 square feet. The lease start dates are November 9, 2021, and January 1, 2022. The rental rates are $35 and $26 per square foot.

[11] The Complainant disclosed without presenting or explaining the relevance of several Board and court decisions.

[12] The Complainant argued that its analyses indicate that the CRU rental value of properties in close proximity, and of similar competing properties, is $23.00 per square foot and for drive through space is $35.00 per square foot. The requested assessment is $7,338,300.

[13] In Rebuttal, the Complainant explained that one of the five source buildings behind the Respondent's study, 2949 50 Avenue, sits on a shared site with, and its parking area is attached with, an automobile dealership and service centre - a different tenant mix and traffic generator than the Subject - undermining its use as a comparable.

[14] Additionally, the subject property's own post-2020 CRU leasing history, correctly averaged, sits at $29.00 per square foot, below the $30.00 assessed rate, without requiring the Board to resolve any dispute over the comparability.

[15] The Complainant suggested that the Respondent has not rebutted its comparable properties on their individual merits, and that substituting an internally generated dataset – one drawn from only five buildings, including the subject property – does not meet the Respondent's evidentiary burden once it has raised a prima facie case.

[16] The complaint regarding the drive through rental rate was withdrawn, leaving the CRU rental rate at $23 per square foot as its only requested change, altering the requested assessment to $7,381,200.

Position of the Respondent

[17] The Respondent summarized that the Complainant raised the issue of whether the CRU space at the subject property should be assessed at $23 per square foot instead of the $30 per square foot assessed. The Respondent’s position is that the subject property is the newest and highest quality retail strip in the municipality and that $30 per square foot rental rate is supported my market leasing analysis of properties that are truly comparable to the subject property.

[18] The Respondent argued that the twelve comparable properties and 31 general comparables presented by the Complainant for the CRU spaces lack details of how they are comparable to the subject property.

[19] Whilst the drive through CRU rental rate requested is $35 per square foot when the comparable properties and the subject property itself support the $37 per square foot assessment.

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

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

[22] The Respondent reviewed the Complainant's rent roll and pointed out that it was from 2022, it provided information from the 2025 assessment request for information (ARFI) to show that the rent has increased to $37 per square foot versus the $35 per square foot presented.

[23] The Respondent explained that they receive significant response to their annual ARFI requests and with that information, it identified four similar properties to the subject property and provided an analysis including the subject property to 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. The actual rents in place for subject property CRU space range from $26 to $31 per square foot with a median of $30 and an average of $29 per square foot.

[24] The Respondent included information regarding the drive through space, but the Complainant had withdrawn their complaint regarding that portion of the assessment.

[25] 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

[26] The Board finds that the drive through CRU space is no longer under complaint.

[27] The Board finds that none of the Complainant comparable properties are comparable to the subject property raising the question of onus. However, the Board is not dismissing the Complainant due to the lack of evidence.

[28] 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 subject property. 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 31 general comparable rental rates with insufficient information to ascertain if they are comparable to the subject property. Of the twelve comparable rental rates, additional detail is provided, but the newest property was built in 2007 (15 years older) and the oldest property was built in 1978 (44 years older), whilst many of the locations are collector roads versus major traffic routes.

[29] The Board also examined the rent roll of the subject property and finds that, overall, the assessment is supported by the subject property rent roll.

DECISION SUMMARY

[30] The Board finds that the original assessed value is Confirmed at $7,830,300.

[31] 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	197
C.2	Complainant Rebuttal	33
R.1	Respondent Submissions	63 pages excluding page 43 (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.