VALUATION TRIBUNAL FOR ENGLAND

Non-domestic rating appeal (2010 List): Local Government Finance Act 1988; Non-Domestic Rating (Alteration of Lists and Appeals) (England) Regulations 2009 [SI 2009 No 2268]; Hughes (VO) v York Museums and Gallery Trust [2017] UKUT 200 (LC); Gardiner & Theobald LLP v Jackson (VO) [2018] UKUT 0253 (LC); Hughes (VO) v Exeter City Council [2020] UKUT 0007 (LC); Museum and premises; Art gallery and premises; historic property and premises; valuation method; receipts and expenditure valuation; appeals allowed

APPEAL NUMBERS:	(1) 450526123414/539N10; (2) 451026123989/539N10; (3) 451026123985/539N10;	(4) 452026123371/539N10; (5) 332526502798/537N10; (6) 274125055588/539N10

RE:
(1) Shipley Art Gallery, Prince Consort Road, Gateshead, Tyne and Wear, NE8 4JB ("Shipley Art Gallery");
(2) The Discovery Centre, Blandford House, Blandford Square, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 4HZ ("The Discovery Centre");
(3) Laing Art Gallery, Higham Place, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 8AG ("Laing Art Gallery");
(4) South Shields Museum, 6 Ocean Road, South Shields, Tyne and Wear, NE33 2HZ ("South Shields Museum");
(5) Chard Museum Society, High Street, Chard, Somerset, TA20 1QL ("Chard Museum"); and
(6) Fairfax House, Castlegate, York, YO1 9RN ("Fairfax House")
(together the "subject hereditaments")

BETWEEN:
(1) (2) (3) (4) Tyne & Wear Museums Service
(5) Chard & District Museum Society
(6) York Civic Trust — Appellants

and

The Valuation Officer — Respondent

SITTING: *remotely by Microsoft Teams conference call*

ON: Friday 6 November 2020 at 10:00 hours

BEFORE: Vice President Mr AV Clark FRICS

CLERK: Mr W Hamilton IRRV(Dip) A.Inst.PA

APPEARANCES:
Mr Colin Hunter of Lambert Smith Hampton for the Appellants
Mr Justin Allen of the Valuation Office Agency for the Respondent (6)
Mr Laurie Hulse of the Valuation Office Agency for the Respondent (5)
Mr Trevor Thompson of the Valuation Office Agency for the Respondent (1) (2) (3) (4)

DECISION, STATEMENT OF REASONS and ORDER

Regulations 36, 37 and 38 of the Valuation Tribunal for England (Council Tax and Rating Appeals) (Procedure) Regulations 2009 [SI 2009 No 2269]

Summary of decision

1. The appeals are allowed.

2. I am satisfied that the rateable values of the subject hereditaments shown in the 2010 non-domestic rating list (the “rating list”) are incorrect. I determine that –

   (a) Shipley Art Gallery, Laing Art Gallery and South Shields Museum are to be shown in the rating list with a rateable value of £10 with effect from 1 April 2015;

   (b) The Discovery Centre is to be shown in the rating list with a rateable value of £93,500 with effect from 1 April 2015;

   (c) Chard Museum is to be shown in the rating list with a rateable value of £300 with effect from 1 April 2015; and

   (d) Fairfax House is to be shown in the rating list with a rateable value of £10 with effect from 1 April 2010.

Reasons

3. This statement of reasons is not, and does not purport to be, a full verbatim record of proceedings. I gave proper judicial consideration to all the evidence and arguments put forward in the course of the proceedings, whether or not they are fully set out in this statement of reasons.

Background

4. These six appeals arise in consequence of proposals made by the Appellants which sought alterations to the rating list. The proposal in respect of Fairfax House was made on 9 February 2015. The proposals for Shipley Art Gallery, The Discovery Centre, Laing Art Gallery and South Shields Museum were made on 22 September 2015. Finally, the proposal for Chard Museum was made on 16 December 2015.

5. Each proposal sought a reduction in the rateable value to £10, being a nominal value. The grounds cited in each proposal being that the existing valuations were incorrect, excessive and bad in law. Except for the proposal in respect of Fairfax House, any alterations ordered by the Tribunal would take effect from 1 April 2015 (see paragraph 21 below). Any alteration in respect of Fairfax House would take effect from 1 April 2010.

6. As no agreement had been reached within three months of the proposals having been made, the Respondent referred the disagreements to the Tribunal as appeals, pursuant to Regulation 13 of the Non-Domestic Rating (Alterations of Lists and Appeals) (England) Regulations 2009 [SI 2009 No 2268] (the “Alterations and Appeals Regulations”).

7. All six appeals have been previously listed for hearings before a Tribunal Panel, but ultimately were stayed pending the Upper Tribunal’s consideration of a similar matter, relating to the Royal Albert Memorial Museum and Art Gallery in Exeter. That matter was heard by the

Upper Tribunal in June 2019 and its judgment - *Hughes (VO) v Exeter City Council* [2020] UKUT 0007 (LC) - was handed down on 8 January 2020.

8. After allowing time for the parties to digest the Upper Tribunal's judgment and for a period of continued discussions, the Tribunal listed these stayed appeals for hearing on the same day.

Remote hearing

9. On 29 July 2020, the President of the Tribunal issued the COVID-19 Variation of Practice Statement. In that statement, the President has determined, for the purposes of Regulation 6(3)(g) of the Valuation Tribunal for England (Council Tax and Rating Appeals) (Procedure) Regulations 2009 [SI 2009 No 2269] (the "Tribunal's Procedure Regulations"), that the form of any hearings before the Tribunal would include "remote hearings". Specifically, the President states that this is to include the use of Microsoft Teams conferencing software. Further, the President directs that remote hearings would be the default until such time as it is safe for the Tribunal to return to normal practice.

10. In accordance with that Practice Statement, I conducted the hearing of these appeals remotely via Microsoft Teams conference call using video/audio-link. For the avoidance of any doubt, I am satisfied that those present at the hearing were able to fully participate in the proceedings.

Consolidation and modified hearing procedure

11. At the commencement of the hearing, the parties' representatives agreed to the six appeals being consolidated and heard before me as one, noting key differences as appropriate. Therefore, I consolidated the hearing of the six appeals pursuant to the Tribunal's general power at Regulation 6 of the Tribunal's Procedure Regulations.

12. In view of the consolidation, I modified the hearing procedure, again with the consent of the parties. The Appellants' representative presented all his cases first, which was followed by cross-examination from each of the Respondent's representatives prior to their own submission and returned cross-examination.

The Appellants' representative

13. Mr Hunter, a member of the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors and of the Institute of Revenues, Rating and Valuation, appeared on behalf of the Appellants as expert witness and advocate. Mr Hunter's declaration of truth (contained in his written submissions) included a statement that he was instructed on a results-based fee basis, but that the provision of his expert opinion and his attendance upon the Tribunal is based upon a fixed fee. In his written statement, Mr Hunter declared that he understood and accepted that his duty was to the Tribunal in giving his evidence, that he would comply with this duty, and the requirements of his professional bodies, regardless of whether or not the evidence supported the Appellants' case.

14. Mindful of the Upper Tribunal's judgment in *Gardiner & Theobald LLP v Jackson (VO)* [2018] UKUT 0253 (LC), I accepted Mr Hunter's evidence as expert witness on the above basis because –

    (a) to do otherwise would be contrary to the requirements to deal with cases proportionately, avoiding unnecessary formality and ensuring parties are able to participate in proceedings (Regulation 3 of the Tribunal Procedure Regulations); and

(b) the Tribunal may admit evidence irrespective of whether it would be admissible in a civil trial (Regulation 17(2)(a) of the Tribunal Procedure Regulations).

15. I therefore considered Mr Hunter's evidence and attached such weight to it as I saw fit.

The Respondent's representatives

16. The Respondent was represented by –

(a) Mr Thompson in respect of Shipley Art Gallery, The Discovery Centre, Laing Art Gallery and South Shields Museum;

(b) Mr Hulse in respect of Chard Museum; and

(c) Mr Allen in respect of Fairfax House.

Each Representative appeared as both advocate and expert witness.

Relevant Law

Non-domestic rating: general

17. Part III of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 (the "Act") makes provision for the payment of a non-domestic rate in respect of non-domestic hereditaments in England. The rateable value of a non-domestic hereditament, which is used to determine the amount of the rate payable, is defined at paragraph 2(1) of Schedule 6 to the Act (which is commonly referred to as the "rating hypothesis").

18. For these proceedings, it is not necessary to set out all the provisions but suffice it to say that the rateable value of any hereditament is to be taken to be the amount, determined in accordance with the statutory assumptions, equal to the rent at which it is estimated the hereditament might reasonably be expected to let from year to year, on 1 April 2008 (the "antecedent valuation date").

19. In determining rateable value, matters affecting the physical state or enjoyment of the hereditament and the mode and category of occupation are, amongst other things, taken to be as they were on the material day. The Non-Domestic Rating (Material Day for List Alterations) Regulations 1992 [SI 1992 No 556] (the "Material Day Regulations") provides for determining the material day. The proposals in these appeals attack the rateable value shown in the rating list for each of the subject hereditaments on the day it was compiled. Therefore, the material day is 1 April 2010, being the day on which the rating list was compiled.

Effective date restriction

20. Regulation 14 of the Alterations and Appeals Regulations provides for the effective date of any alteration to an entry in the list. Given that this point was not contentious, I do not feel it necessary to set out the provision in full.

21. I shall just say that it was common ground between the parties that, except in the case of Fairfax House, the effective date of any alteration would be restricted to 1 April 2015. This follows an amendment to Regulation 14, which restricted the retrospective effect of any proposal made after 1 April 2015. For Fairfax House, the proposal was made prior to 1 April

2015, therefore any amendment consequent to that proposal can have retrospective effect to the commencement of the rating list, 1 April 2010.

Authorities and previous Valuation Tribunal decisions

22. Naturally, I was referred to the Upper Tribunal's judgment in *Hughes (VO) v Exeter City Council*, given that these proceedings were stayed pending that judgment. I was also referred to the following judgments –

    (a) *Hoare & Anor v National Trust* [1998] EWCA Civ 1525;

    (b) *Hughes (VO) v York Museums and Gallery Trust* [2017] UKUT 200 (LC);

    (c) *Bluebell Railway Limited v Ball (VO)* [1984] RA 113.

23. I was also referred to two previous decisions of this Tribunal –

    (a) *City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council v Valuation Officer* [2011] VTE (470514161196/244N05); and

    (b) *Continuum (Kent Life) Limited v Corkish (VO)* [2018] VTE (223519935246/537N10).

Discussion

24. For each of the subject hereditaments, I have appended to this decision a copy of the parties' respective valuations.

Valuation method

25. For the Discovery Centre, Laing Art Gallery and South Shields Museum, the parties were agreed that the receipts and expenditure method was the appropriate method of valuation. Mr Hunter provided receipts and expenditure valuations for each of the hereditaments.

26. In the case of Shipley Art Gallery, Mr Thompson was defending a revised valuation of £4,000, based on 2.5% of the gross receipts. Following the Valuation Office Agency's Rating Manual, he contended that it was appropriate to value Shipley Art Gallery on this basis like a visitor attraction. Mr Hunter stressed that the section of the rating manual upon which Mr Thompson relied was not agreed with professional practice, and under cross-examination, Mr Thompson agreed that he did not have any evidence to support a valuation on this basis.

27. In the case of Fairfax House, like Mr Thompson for Shipley Art Gallery, Mr Allen was defending a revised valuation of £4,500, based on a 2.5% of the gross receipts. Mr Allen calculated gross receipts by adopting Mr Hunter's figure which he rounded-up. Mr Allen contended that, as there was a passing rent on Fairfax House, there must be a positive valuation.

28. In the case of Chard Museum, Mr Hulse was defending a revised valuation of £3,500, based on its storage use. He calculated this revised rateable value on the basis of there being 100m^2 of storage at the hereditament and a storage price in the locality of £35/m^2. Mr Hulse adopted this approach to valuing Chard Museum because, on "stand back and look" the receipts and expenditure valuation provided a rateable value in excess of the passing rent. I do note that to arrive at a nominal valuation, Mr Hunter adjusted the net income without a breakdown. I adopt adjustments of £1,000 for repairs, £2,000 for insurance and £5,000 for utilities, being those figures provided by Mr Hunter under examination.

29. In my view, there is only one potential occupier for each of the subject hereditaments, being the present occupier. Accordingly, I am satisfied that it is appropriate, following the Upper Tribunal's judgments in *Hughes (VO) v Exeter City Council* and *Hughes (VO) v York Museums and Gallery Trust*, to value based on the full receipts and expenditure basis. I do not find that the Respondent's method of valuing based upon a percentage of receipts to be an appropriate or fair valuation method in all the circumstances. I also do not consider that it is appropriate to value Chard Museum based on its available storage; that does not conform to the mode and category for any of the subject hereditaments.

Admissions receipts

30. In respect of Shipley Art Gallery, The Discovery Centre, Laing Art Gallery and South Shields Museum, the parties disputed the calculation of receipts from admissions.

31. Mr Hunter's valuations showed much lower numbers of visitors compared to the Respondent's valuations. Mr Hunter explained that the difference was attributable, in the main to repeat visitors. He presented a comprehensive analysis of the visitor numbers and the split between those paying for a single visit and those paying a higher fee for multiple visits.

32. Mr Thompson took a different approach, treating every visit as generating admissions receipts. He also sought to split out receipts for children, which, except in the case of the Discovery Centre, Mr Hunter contended was unavailable to him on the available data. It was also raised that the admissions prices used in Mr Hunter's valuations were reduced by value added tax ("VAT") at a rate of 20%. But, at the antecedent valuation date, the applicable VAT rate was 17.5%.

33. Based upon the evidence before me I am satisfied that Mr Hunter's analysis provides a more accurate and fairer representation of the admissions receipts. I, therefore, adopt his admissions figures over those of the Respondent. However, I do consider that an adjustment must be made to the Appellant's admissions figures to reflect the prevailing VAT rate at the antecedent valuation date.

Decision

34. In view of my above conclusions I am satisfied that the appeals should be allowed as I have set out at paragraph 2, above. I have included my valuations alongside those for the Appellants and Respondent in the appendices.

35. Finally, I note that in each case, the proposals for each of the subject hereditaments sought for a reduction in the rateable value to £10. I am therefore limited to this value where I have determined a nominal value, but nevertheless, £10 is a nominal value.

Order

36. In view of the above decision, the Tribunal orders –

(a) the Respondent shall alter the rating list to show –

(i) Shipley Art Gallery, Laing Art Gallery, South Shields Museum with a rateable value of £10 with effect from 1 April 2015

(ii) The Discovery Centre with a rateable value of £93,500 with effect from 1 April 2015,

(iii) Chard Museum is to be shown in the list with a rateable value of £300 with effect from 1 April 2015, and

(iv) Fairfax House with a rateable value of £10 with effect from 1 April 2010; and

(b) the Respondent shall comply with this order within two weeks.

Appendix 1: Valuations for Shipley Art Gallery

		Appellants			Valuation Officer			Tribunal	
Income									
Admissions									
Adults	13,000	£3.75	£48,750	23,004	£3.82	£87,875	13,000	£3.82	£49,660
Children	Nil		£0	6,714	£2.13	£14,301	Nil		£0
Annual	7,000	£6.67	£46,690	Nil		£0	7,000	£6.81	£47,670
Schools	Nil		£0	4,250	£2.13	£9,053	Nil		£0
Subtotal	*20,000*		*£95,440*	*33,968*		*£111,229*	*20,000*		*£97,330*
Gift Aid	12%		£11,453	12%		£13,347	12%		£11,680
Shop Sales			£33,000			£33,000			£33,000
Venue Hire			£1,500			£1,500			£1,500
Catering			£0			£0			£0
Total Income			£141,393			£159,076			£143,510
Expenditure					Taken at 2.5%	£3,977			
Trading Costs					**RV say**	**£4,000**			
Sales			£16,500						£16,500
Venue Staffing			£0						£0
Credit Cards			£800						£800
EPOS			£160						£160
Staffing									
Front of House			£140,000						£140,000
Venue Manager			£45,000						£45,000
Curatorial			£52,000						£52,000
Learning			£25,000						£25,000
Exhibitions			£25,000						£25,000
Marketing			£8,500						£8,500
Documentation			£6,200						£6,200
Trading			£0						£0
Other Employee Costs			£3,000						£3,000
Premises									
Repairs			£29,000						£29,000
Utilities			£15,000						£15,000
Rates			£7,743						£7,743
Cleaning/Refuse			£8,700						£8,700
Insurance			£21,000						£21,000
Telephones			£4,800						£4,800
Supplies									
Equipment			£2,700						£2,700
Clothes/Uniforms			£500						£500
Stationary			£3,000						£3,000
Display maintenance			£40,000						£40,000
Total Expenditure			£454,603						£454,603
Net Income			-£313,210						-£311,093
Rent	30%		£0				30%		£0
		RV Say	**£1**					**RV Say**	**Nominal**

Appendix 2: Valuations for The Discovery Centre

	Appellants			Valuation Officer			Tribunal		
Income									
Admissions									
Adults	77,500	£4.17	£323,175	324,128	£4.25	£87,875	77,500	£4.25	£329,375
Children	77,500	£2.10	£162,750	108,043	£2.55	£14,301	77,500	£2.12	£164,300
Annual	95,000	£7.50	£712,500	Nil		£0	95,000	£7.66	£727,700
Schools	Nil		£0	21,000	£2.55	£9,053	Nil		£0
Subtotal	*250,000*		*£1,198,425*	*453,171*		*£1,706,604*	*250,000*		*£1,221,375*
Gift Aid	12%		£143,811	12%		£204,792	12%		£146,565
Shop Sales			£80,000			£80,000			£80,000
Venue Hire			£35,000			£35,000			£35,000
Catering			£30,000			£30,000			£30,000
Total Income			£1,487,236			£2,056,396			£1,512,940
Expenditure									
Trading Costs									
Sales			£42,000			£42,000			£42,000
Venue Staffing			£10,000			£10,000			£10,000
Credit Cards			£850			£850			£850
EPOS			£170			£170			£170
Staffing									
Front of House			£450,000			£450,000			£450,000
Venue Manager			£58,000			£58,000			£58,000
Curatorial			£58,000			£58,000			£58,000
Learning			£98,000			£98,000			£98,000
Exhibitions			£70,000			£70,000			£70,000
Marketing			£35,000			£35,000			£35,000
Trading			£12,000			£12,000			£12,000
Training			£4,000			£4,000			£4,000
Premises									
Repairs			£130,000			£130,000			£130,000
Utilities			£130,000			£130,000			£130,000
Rates			£38,069			£38,069			£38,069
Cleaning/Refuse			£90,000			£90,000			£90,000
Insurance			£23,000			£23,000			£23,000
Telephones			£11,500			£11,500			£11,500
Supplies									
Equipment			£3,000			£3,000			£3,000
Clothes/Uniforms			£4,000			£4,000			£4,000
Stationary			£900			£900			£900
Display maintenance			£10,000			£10,000			£10,000
Total Expenditure			£1,278,489			£1,278,489			£1,278,489
Net Income			£208,747			£777,907			£234,451
Rent		40%	£83,499		50%	£388,954		40%	£93,780
		RV Say	**£83,500**		**RV Say**	**£385,000**		**RV Say**	**£93,500**

Appendix 3: Valuations for Laing Art Gallery

	Appellants			Valuation Officer			Tribunal		
Income									
Admissions									
Adults	70,000	£4.17	£291,900	189,422	£4.25	£805,044	70,000	£4.25	£297,500
Children	Nil			63,141	£2.55	£161,010	Nil		
Annual	50,000	£7.50	£375,00	Nil		£0	50,000	£7.66	£383,000
Schools	Nil		£0	11,000	£2.55	£28,050	Nil		
Subtotal	*120,000*		*£666,900*	*263,563*		*£994,103*	*120,000*		*£680,500*
Gift Aid	12%		£80,028	12%		£119,22	12%		£81,660
Shop Sales			£145,000			£145,000			£145,000
Venue Hire			£12,000			£12,000			£12,000
Catering			£18,000			£18,000			£18,000
Total Income			£921,928			£1,288,395			£937,160
Expenditure									
Trading Costs									
Sales			£79,000			£79,000			£79,000
Venue Staffing			£31,000			£31,000			£31,000
Credit Cards			£2,600			£2,600			£2,600
EPOS			£160			£160			£160
Staffing									
Front of House			£300,000			£300,000			£300,000
Venue Manager			£60,000			£60,000			£60,000
Curatorial			£24,000			£24,000			£24,000
Learning			£61,000			£61,000			£61,000
Exhibitions			£59,000			£59,000			£59,000
Marketing			£27,000			£27,000			£27,000
Documentation			£20,000			£20,000			£20,000
Trading			£8,500			£8,500			£8,500
Training			£5,000			£5,000			£5,000
Premises									
Repairs			£55,000			£55,000			£55,000
Utilities			£46,000			£46,000			£46,000
Rates			£13,121			£13,121			£13,121
Cleaning/Refuse			£22,000			£22,000			£22,000
Insurance			£89,000			£89,000			£89,000
Telephones			£7,400			£7,400			£7,400
Supplies									
Equipment			£10,000			£10,000			£10,000
Clothes/Uniforms			£2,700			£2,700			£2,700
Stationary			£2000			£2000			£2000
Display maintenance			£40,000			£40,000			£40,000
Total Expenditure			£964,481			£964,481			£964,481
Net Income			-£42,553			£323,914			-27,321
Rent		30%	£-12,766		50%	£161,957		30%	-£8,196
		RV Say	**£1**		**RV Say**	**£160,000**		**RV Say**	**Nominal**

Appendix 4: Valuation for South Shields Museum

	Appellants			Valuation Officer			Tribunal		
Income									
Admissions									
Adults	29,000	£3.33	£96,570	121,932	£3.83	£467,000	29,000	£3.40	£98,600
Children	Nil			40,644	£2.13	£86,572	Nil		
Annual	43,500	£5.83	£253,605	Nil			43,500	£5.95	£258,825
Schools	Nil			4,250	£2.13	£9,053	Nil		
Subtotal	*72,500*		*£350,175*	*166,826*		*£562,624*	*72,500*		*£357,425*
Gift Aid	12%		£42,021	12%		£67,515	12%		£42,891
Shop Sales			£30,000			£30,000			£30,000
Venue Hire			£1,200			£1,200			£1,200
Catering			Nil			Nil			Nil
Total Income			£423,396			£661,339			£431,516
Expenditure									
Trading Costs									
Sales			£18,000			£42,000			£42,000
Venue Staffing			Nil			£10,000			£10,000
Credit Cards			£450			£850			£850
EPOS			Nil			£170			£170
Staffing									
Front of House			£187,000			£187,000			£187,000
Venue Manager			£65,000			£65,000			£65,000
Curatorial			£58,000			£58,000			£58,000
Learning			£32,000			£32,000			£32,000
Exhibitions			£22,000			£22,000			£22,000
Marketing			£16,000			£16,000			£16,000
Trading			£11,000			£11,000			£11,000
Other Employee Costs			£6,000			£6,000			£6,000
Premises									
Repairs			£20,000			£20,000			£20,000
Utilities			£20,000			£20,000			£20,000
Rates			£4,620			£4,620			£4,620
Cleaning/Refuse			£6,000			£6,000			£6,000
Insurance			£7,500			£7,500			£7,500
Telephones			£3,800			£3,800			£3,800
Supplies									
Equipment			£1,500			£1,500			£1,500
Clothes/Uniforms			£400			£400			£400
Stationary			£3,000			£3,000			£3,000
Display maintenance			£30,000			£30,000			£30,000
Total Expenditure			£512,270			£512,270			£512,270
Net Income			-£88,874			£149,069			-£80,754
Rent		30%	-£26,662		50%	£74,534		30%	-£24,226
		RV Say	**£1**		**RV Say**	**£72,500**		**RV Say**	**Nominal**

Appendix 5: Valuations for Chard Museum

	Appellants	Valuation Officer			Tribunal
Income					
Admissions	£3,800	Value of use as storage			£3,800
Gift Aid	£1,800	$100m^2$ @ £35/m^2			£1,800
Friends	£4,500				£4,500
Donations	£3,000	**RV Say**	**£3,500**		£3,000
Shop Income	£1,300				£1,300
Fund Raising	2,200				2,200
Total Income	£16,600				£16,600
Expenditure					
Insurance/Security	£1,200				£1,200
Rates	£1,700				£1,700
Maintenance	£450				£450
Printing & Stationary	£200				£200
Postage & Telephone	£500				£500
Publicity	£700				£700
Display	£180				£180
Conservation	£300				£300
Shop Purchases	£570				£570
Fundraising	£250				£250
Cleaning	£1,400				£1,400
Admin/Sundries	£150				£150
Total Expenditure	£7,600				£7,600
Net Income	£9,000				£9,000
Adjustments					
Appellant adjusts to give a negligible figure				Repairs	£1,000
				Insurance	£2,000
RV Say	**£1**			Utilities	£5,000
				Total adjustments	£8,000
				Adjusted net income	£1,000
				Rent 30%	£300
				RV Say	**£300**

<u>**Appendix 6: Valuations for Fairfax House**</u>

	Appellants		Valuation Officer		Tribunal	
Income						
Admissions		£82,000				£82,000
Donations		£2,000				£2,000
Corporate Membership		£1,000				£1,000
Membership Subscriptions		£16,000				£16,000
Retail Sales		£50,000				£50,000
Events & Functions		£26,000				£26,000
Miscellaneous		£2,000				£2,000
Total Income		£179,000		£180,000		£179,000
			@ 2.5%	£4,500		
			RV Say	**£4,500**		
Expenditure						
Staffing Costs		£94,000				£94,000
Premises		£15,000				£15,000
Office Expenses		£9,000				£9,000
Running Expenses		£9,000				£9,000
Exhibition Costs		£20,000				£20,000
Costs of Sales		£45,000				£45,000
Marketing		£35,000				£35,000
Total Expenditure		£227,000				£227,000
Net Income		-£48,000				-£48,000
Rent	30%	-£14,400			30%	-£14,000
	RV Say	**£1**			**RV Say**	**Nominal**