IN THE VALUATION TRIBUNAL FOR ENGLAND
IN THE MATTER OF A 2023 RATING LIST APPEAL

Case No: 1. CHG101351854
2. CHG101244168

Sitting remotely using
Microsoft Teams on
1 September 2026

Date: 18 September 2026

SCHEDULE 11 TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE ACT 1988

RATING — Local Government Finance Act 1988 — appeals against the accuracy of the rateable values for the hereditaments; industrial properties in Andover; appeals dismissed.

Before:

MRS A E FIELDER
MISS T BEGUM

Between:

1. ROB POND LTD
2. MOTOR PARTS DIRECT LIMITED — **Appellant**

- and -

ANDREW MOULAND
(VALUATION OFFICER) — **Respondent**

Regarding:

1. UNIT 2, GLENMORE TRADE PARK, GREENWICH WAY, ANDOVER, SP10 4EY
2. UNIT 4, GLENMORE TRADE PARK, GREENWICH WAY, ANDOVER, SP10 4EY
(the "subject properties")

Mr B O'Neill (instructed by Ryan Property Tax Services UK Limited), for the **Appellant**
Mr S Todd-Webster for the **Respondent**

DECISION AND STATEMENT OF REASONS

DECISION

1. The appeals were dismissed.

2. The Tribunal panel made no change to the rating list entries in respect of the subject properties.

STATEMENT OF REASONS

Introduction

3. In accordance with regulation 13A of the Non-Domestic Rating (Alteration of Lists and Appeals) (England) Regulations 2009, two appeals have been made to this Tribunal on the grounds that the rateable value (RV) for the appeal properties is not reasonable.

4. The panel consolidated the hearing of the appeals, as the parties were using the same supporting evidence. Further, in each case the Appellants' representative was the same, as was the Valuation Officer's caseworker.

5. A brief history of each list entry and the parties' respective positions is summarised as follows:

Rob Pond Ltd - CHG101351854
Unit 2, Glenmore Trade Park, Greenwich Way, Andover, Hants, SP10 4EY

- Warehouse and premises
- Original RV £40,250 effective from 1 April 2023, based on a tone of £120/m^2.
- Proposal sought a reduction to £19,750 RV, based on a tone of £52.50/m^2, from the same date.
- As a result of the proposal, the Valuation Officer reduced the RV to £31,000, based on a tone of £90/m^2.
- At the hearing, the Appellant's representative stated that he sought a reduction to £23,000 RV based on a tone of £70/m^2.

Motor Parts Direct Limited - CHG101244168
Unit 4, Glenmore Trade Park, Greenwich Way, Andover, Hants, SP10 4EY

- Warehouse and premises
- Original RV £37,750 effective from 1 April 2023, based on a tone of £120/m^2.
- Proposal sought a reduction to £17,250 RV, based on a tone of £52.50/m^2, from the same date.
- As a result of the proposal, the Valuation Officer reduced the RV to £31,000, based on a tone of £90/m^2.
- At the hearing, the Appellant's representative stated that he sought a reduction to £25,000 RV based on a tone of £70/m^2.

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

Background

7. The appeal properties comprise modern warehouse and trade counter units situated at Glenmore Trade Park, Greenwich Way, Andover. The trade park comprises eight industrial units located in an established commercial area fronting Newbury Road, close to the Andover Ring Road. The properties are of modern construction, having been developed around 2017-18, and are of steel portal frame construction with brick and clad elevations beneath pitched roofs. Each unit benefits from dedicated parking and servicing areas.

8. The evidence before the panel comprised all material disclosed and exchanged during the challenge process, including rental evidence, rental analyses and comparable assessment evidence. Shortly before the hearing, the Valuation Officer submitted photographs taken during an inspection of the appeal properties carried out in the preceding week. No objection was raised by the Appellants to the inclusion of this additional evidence.

9. Mr O'Neill, as representative for the two Appellants, appeared in a dual role of advocate and expert witness. He stated that he was being paid on a contingency fee basis but was aware that in giving expert evidence his responsibility was to the Tribunal.

10. The panel accepted this expert witness evidence on the above basis, as to do otherwise would be contrary to regulation 3 (Discharge of VTE functions-general) of the Procedure regulations and was allowable due to the Tribunal's rules on admissibility of evidence (regulation 17(2)(a) where the Tribunal can admit evidence whether or not it would be admissible in a civil trial in England). The panel, therefore, considered the "expert" evidence and attached such weight to it as it saw fit.

11. Mr Todd-Webster, for the Valuation Officer, also appeared in a dual role of advocate and expert witness.

Relevant Law

12. The term "rateable value" was defined in Schedule 6 to the Local Government Finance Act 1988 (as amended). The value was required to reflect an annual rent on the property, assuming a new letting with the tenant responsible for all rates, taxes, repairs and insurance. In respect of the 2023 rating list, the Rating Lists (Valuation Date) (England) Order 2020 (SI 2020 No.832) requires the rental levels to be taken on 1 April 2021. In respect of the subject appeals, the material day is 1 April 2023.

Discussion

13. At the hearing, Mr O'Neill revised the Appellants' position from £65/m² to £70/m². He explained that having considered material provided by the Valuation Officer regarding the tenant's fit-out works at Unit 2, he accepted that some allowance should be made for those works. He therefore increased his analysed figure by £6/m² to reflect what he considered to be a basic level of fit-out.

14. The principal issue for the panel was whether the Valuation Officer's adopted tone of £90/m² remained excessive and whether the Appellants had demonstrated that a lower tone of £70/m² should be adopted for the appeal properties. The Appellants relied primarily on the November 2020 letting of Unit 2, which was the rental evidence closest to the antecedent valuation date and therefore attracted the greatest weight. The panel accepted that, in

accordance with the principles in *Lotus and Delta v Culverwell*, this rent provided the starting point for the valuation exercise.

15. The panel found that the parties' analyses of the Unit 2 rent differed significantly because of the treatment of the tenant fit-out costs. The Appellant argued that only a modest allowance should be made for the fit-out works, contending that the unit was largely fitted and ready for occupation and that the additional works undertaken were relatively basic. The Valuation Officer submitted that the premises were let as a shell unit and relied upon evidence of works costing approximately £33,000, including electrical installations, office partitioning, welfare facilities and fire protection measures. Whilst Mr O'Neill accepted at the hearing that some adjustment should be made for these works, this was his explanation for revising his figure upwards by £6/m², the panel was not persuaded that this allowance adequately reflected the nature and extent of the works evidenced before it.

16. The panel preferred the Valuation Officer's analysis, which was supported by detailed cost information and, applying the principles established in *Bunyan (VO) v Acenden Ltd*, derived an adjusted rental analysis of approximately £88.43/m². The panel considered that this provided strong support for the adopted tone of £90/m².

17. The panel also considered the other rental evidence relied upon by the parties. Much of this evidence related to lettings agreed in 2018 and was therefore substantially removed from the antecedent valuation date. While the evidence provided useful background and context, the panel attached less weight to it because of its age. Nevertheless, with the exception of the Appellant's analysis of Unit 2, the rents analysed within a range broadly consistent with a tone close to £90/m².

18. The panel also considered the agreed assessments and challenge settlements relating to other units within Glenmore Trade Park, including Units 3, 5 and 8, which reflected a tone of £90/m². Mr O'Neill submitted that caution should be exercised when considering these settlements because he had obtained the Unit 2 rental information through his client and that evidence may not have been available to those parties when their cases were resolved. The panel accepted that point. However, having found that the Unit 2 letting, when properly adjusted for fit-out costs, supported a level close to £90/m², the panel considered the settlements to be consistent with the wider evidence and supportive of the established tone within the scheme. The panel also attached weight to the fact that the agreements had been reached independently by different ratepayers and representatives.

19. Taking all the evidence together, the panel was not persuaded that the Appellants had demonstrated that a tone of £70/m² was reasonable. The weight of the evidence supported a tone close to £90/m² and, in particular, the panel found that a proper analysis of the Unit 2 letting supported the Valuation Officer's adopted level.

Conclusion

20. Having considered all the evidence and submissions, the panel finds that the Appellants have not established that the assessments are excessive. The panel is satisfied that the Valuation Officer has correctly analysed the Unit 2 letting by taking account of the tenant fit-out costs and that this analysis supports the adopted tone of £90/m². The remaining rental evidence and comparable assessments do not support the Appellants' proposed tone of £70/m² and are broadly consistent with the existing scheme tone.

21. Accordingly, the panel concludes that the current rateable values of £29,250 for Unit 2 and £31,000 for Unit 4 are reasonable and no alteration to the 2023 rating list is required. The appeals are therefore dismissed.

Right of further appeal

22. 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.

23. 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 A E Fielder, Senior Member (Chair)
Miss T Begum, Member
18 September 2026

Mrs K Edhouse-Thomas
Clerk to the Tribunal
Date issued to the parties: 18 September 2026