IN THE VALUATION TRIBUNAL FOR ENGLAND
IN THE MATTER OF A 2017 RATING LIST APPEAL

Case No: CHG100760067

Sitting remotely using Microsoft Teams on 26 June 2026

Date: 17 July 2026

SCHEDULE 11 TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE ACT 1988

RATING — Local Government Finance Act 1988 — offices and premises; price per m^2 in dispute; rental evidence; comparable assessments; appeal dismissed.

Before:

MRS N CARMAN
MS A URSPRUNG
Between:

SANTANDER UK PLC — **Appellant**

- and -

NICOLA JOHNSON (VALUATION OFFICER) — **Respondent**

Regarding:

BST-7TH FLRS 100 LUDGATE HILL, LONDON, EC4M 7HY
(the "subject property")

Mr A Waller from G L Hearn representing the Appellant
Mr A McKillop for the Respondent

DECISION AND STATEMENT OF REASONS

DECISION

1. The appeal is dismissed.

2. The Tribunal found that the entry in the 2017 rating list was not unreasonable, and confirmed the rateable value (RV) of £2,330,000 with effect from 23 January 2020.

STATEMENT OF REASONS

Introduction

3. This is a 2017 rating list appeal. Following a merger of previously separate assessments, Bst-7th Floors, 100 Ludgate Hill, London, EC4M 7HY (the ‘subject property’) had been entered in the 2017 rating list as ‘offices and premises’ at £2,350,000 RV with effect from 23 January 2020.

4. A challenge proposal was submitted by G L Hearn on behalf of Santander UK Plc and was received by the Valuation Officer on 20 December 2021. It had been made on the grounds that the RV was inaccurate. A revised RV of £2,130,000 was proposed, based upon an adopted price of £420 per m^2, and an increased allowance of 10% for the ground floor banking hall.

5. The Valuation Officer issued a challenge case decision notice on 19 January 2023, which disagreed with the proposed alteration of the list, but stated that the current rating list entry was unreasonable. A revised RV of £2,330,000 with effect from 23 January 2020 was confirmed, to reflect an increased allowance of 10% for the ground floor banking hall.

6. In accordance with regulation 13A of the Non-Domestic Rating (Alteration of Lists and Appeals) (England) Regulations 2009, the appeal to this Tribunal has been made on the grounds that the valuation for the hereditament is not reasonable. The appeal was received by the Tribunal on 19 May 2023.

7. Mr Waller appeared on behalf of the appellant as both Advocate and expert witness. In view of the Upper Tribunal’s judgment in *Gardiner & Theobald LLP v David Jackson (VO)* [2018] UKUT 0253 (LC), he confirmed that he was not instructed under any conditional fee arrangement. He declared that he understood and accepted that his duty was to the Tribunal in giving his evidence and he would comply with this as well as the requirements of his professional body, regardless of whether the evidence supported the client’s case.

8. This statement of reasons is not, and does not purport to be, a full verbatim record of proceedings.

Preliminary issue

9. The day before the hearing, Mr Waller provided a revised valuation at £2,280,000 RV based on an adopted price of £450 per m^2.

Relevant Law

10. Rateable value is to be determined in accordance with paragraph 2(1) of Schedule 6 to the Local Government Finance Act 1988, which provides:

(1) The rateable value of a non-domestic hereditament none of which consists of domestic property and none of which is exempt from local non-domestic rating shall be taken to be an amount equal to the rent at which it is estimated the hereditament might reasonably be expected to let from year to year on these three assumptions—

(a) the first assumption is that the tenancy begins on the day by reference to which the determination is to be made;

(b) the second assumption is that immediately before the tenancy begins the hereditament is in a state of reasonable repair, but excluding from this assumption any repairs which a reasonable landlord would consider uneconomic.

(c) the third assumption is that the tenant undertakes to pay all usual tenant's rates and taxes and to bear the cost of the repairs and insurance and the other expenses (if any) necessary to maintain the hereditament in a state to command the rent mentioned above.

11. In respect of an appeal against an entry in the 2017 rating list, the rental levels are to be taken as those passing at the antecedent valuation date (AVD) of 1 April 2015, in accordance with the Rating Lists (Valuation Date) (England) Order 2014 (SI 2014 No. 2841).

12. The material day (the date by which physical factors have to be taken into account) was provided by the Non-Domestic Rating (Material Day for List Alterations) Regulations 1992 (SI 1992 No. 556) as amended. In respect of the subject appeal, the material day is 23 January 2020.

Discussion

13. The subject hereditament comprises the basement to the 7th floor of a nine storey building constructed in 1992 and renovated in 2008. The building is located on the north side of Ludgate Hill at the junction of Farringdon Street, and provides retail accommodation to the basement and ground floor with office accommodation to the upper seven floors.

14. The issue to be determined by the panel was the price per m^2 to be adopted for the subject property. The appellant's representative sought a reduction to £450 per m^2, while the Valuation Officer defended the present adopted price of £460 per m^2.

15. It was agreed between the parties that little weight could be attached to the subject rent. The new lease effective from December 2012 was agreed on a stepped basis, and it had been reviewed in December 2017. Both transactions were too remote from the AVD, and would require adjustments. The appellant's challenge cited the following rental evidence:

4th Floor, 5 Old Bailey, EC4M 7BA

A rent effective from 19 April 2014 analysed at £447.76 per m^2. Situated within a mixed use building arranged over six floors, this property was built in 1975 and renovated in 2003 and 2014. The price per m^2 had been reduced at check stage from £475 to £464 per m^2.

1st Floor, 10 Old Bailey, EC4M 7NB

A rent effective from 25 March 2015 analysed at £428.25 per m^2. Situated within an office building of eight floors, the property was built in 2009. The property was assessed at £462.50 per m^2 (discounted from an unadjusted price of £500 per m^2).

5th Floor, 10 Fleet Place, EC4M 7HY

A rent effective from 26 June 2015 analysed at £432.68 per m^2. The property was built of steel frame construction in 1992 and renovated in 2008. It was assessed at £475 per m^2.

16. In response, the Valuation Officer's decision notice highlighted that the appellant had not made an addition for fit out in the rental analysis. Rents in the market generally reflect the un-fitted state of the premises, and as the basis of valuation for rating is of the property fitted out, it was therefore necessary to adjust the rent. The Valuation Officer had applied an 8% uplift to reflect fit out based on market information.

17. In support of the unadjusted price of £460 per m^2, the Valuation Officer scheduled five comparable properties: 5th Floor, 5 Old Bailey, agreed at £464 per m^2; Part Ground Floor Rear and Part Lower Ground Floor, 10 Old Bailey, assessed at £500 per m^2; Part 3rd Floor South and 1st Floor 10 Fleet Place, unadjusted price reduced from £475 to £465 per m^2.

18. The Valuation Officer attached the greatest weight to the key settlement evidence at 5 Old Bailey, with an unadjusted price of £464 per m^2.

19. Mr Waller confirmed that the challenge had been submitted by a colleague three years ago based on rental evidence, and that he had taken over the appeal in the last three months. As the 2017 list was now closed and there were few appeals outstanding, Mr Waller considered that a tone of values had been established. He referred briefly to the rental evidence which was provided in support of the challenge, but his main contention was that as a result of settlements, the adopted tone for the subject property is excessive and inconsistent with the relativities from the 2010 list:

	2010 List	2017 List
100 Ludgate Hill	£355	£460
10 Old Bailey	£370	£480
10 Fleet Place	£360	£455
5 Old Bailey	£290	£464

20. Mr Waller further sought to refer to the difference in relativities present in the 2023 list, however, the Valuation Officer raised an objection as his had not been discussed during challenge negotiations. After a brief adjournment and in considered of the *Denton* test, the panel considered that this was a serious breach and that there was not a good reason to admit this line of argument when the point had already been made in relation to the 2010 list.

21. The Valuation Officer rejected the appellant's comparison between the lists, as each was based on market conditions and values at AVDs seven years apart. The panel also

considered that the purpose of a revaluation was to reassess properties afresh, and that the Valuation Officer was not constrained by relativities from the previous list.

22. It was a point agreed by the parties that at this stage of the 2017 list, the rents had been subsumed into the settled tones. The panel therefore attached most weight to the agreements in respect of the most relevant comparable properties:
    - 5 Old Bailey at £464 per m^2 – a slightly older building which had been refurbished later than the subject property.
    - 10 Fleet Place at £455 per m^2 – built and refurbished at the same time as the subject property.

23. Mr Waller contended that 10 Fleet Place was superior to the subject property, however, the panel heard from the Valuation Officer that works would have been carried out when Santander moved in, and it also had the benefit of a more prominent frontage.

24. In consideration of the settlement evidence, the panel concluded that the appellant had failed to demonstrate that the present adopted price of £460 per m^2 for the subject property was unreasonable.

Conclusion

25. In view of the above findings, the Tribunal confirmed the assessment of the subject property at £2,330,000 RV with effect from 23 January 2020 and dismissed the appeal.

Right of further appeal

26. Any party who is aggrieved at the Tribunal's decision, and who appeared or was represented at the hearing, has a statutory right of further appeal to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) pursuant to Regulation 42 of the Tribunal Procedure Regulations. A party does not require permission to appeal from the Tribunal. Any appeal must be made directly to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) using Form T385 (Notice of appeal) within **four weeks** of the date this decision and statement of reasons was issued.

27. Further information regarding this statutory right of further appeal, and the parties' other rights, is contained in the guidance booklet "*A guide to tribunal decisions"* available on the Tribunal's website at www.valuationtribunal.gov.uk/guidance-booklets/.

Mrs N Carman, Senior Member (Chair)
Ms A Ursprung, Senior Member
17 July 2026

Mrs L Horne
Clerk to the Tribunal
Date issued to the parties: 17 July 2026