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

Case No: CHG101251433
and CHG101251654

Sitting remotely using
Microsoft Teams on
11 September 2026

Date: 8 October 2026

SCHEDULE 11 TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE ACT 1988

Non-domestic rating; 2023 list appeal; Local Government Finance Act 1988; Warehouses and premises; Lotus & Delta Ltd v Culverwell (VO) [1976] RA 141; Specialeyes Ltd v Felgate (VO) [1994] RA 338; Comparable properties; Appeals dismissed.

Before:
MR JP PERCIVAL
MRS N CARMAN

Between:
CHG101251433 CABE ENGINEERING UK LTD
AND
CHG101251654 M N COMMERCIALS LTD
- and -
KAREN GILES
(VALUATION OFFICER)

Appellants

Respondent

Regarding:

19 AND 21, NEW STAR ROAD, LEICESTER LE4 9JD AND
23 NEW STAR ROAD, LEICESTER LE4 9JD
(the "subject properties")

Mr Andrew Simons for the appellant,
Mr Benjamin Hyland for the respondent.

DECISION AND STATEMENT OF REASONS

© CROWN COPYRIGHT 2026

DECISION

1. The appeals are dismissed.

2. The panel found that the rateable values (RV) with effect from 1 April 2023 were reasonable for the subject properties:

19 and 21 New Star Road, Leicester LE4 9JD	RV £79,000
23 New Star Road, Leicester LE4 9JD	RV £72,000

STATEMENT OF REASONS

Introduction

3. These appeals had been brought in respect of the adjacent subject properties both of which are shown in the 2023 rating list as "Workshop and Premises" with effect from 1 April 2023:

19 and 21 New Star Road, Leicester LE4 9JD	RV £79,000
23 New Star Road, Leicester LE4 9JD	RV £72,000

4. The appellants, Cabe Engineering and M N Commercials, had made proposals to challenge their rating list entries to reduce the unadjusted rates of £40/m^2 and £45/m^2 to £35.50/m^2 and £40/m^2 respectively. This would reduce the RV's to £70,000 and £65,000.

5. The respondent valuation officer (VO) considered that the proposals were not well-founded and disagreed with the proposed alterations of the list. The VO considered the rating list entries were reasonable based on the evidence and information available and disagreed with the challenge.

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

Relevant Law

7. The panel referred to the Local Government Finance Act 1988 in respect of the definition of rateable value in paragraph 2(1), Schedule 6 to the Act (as amended). 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 2021 the "antecedent valuation date" (AVD). The material day for this appeal was 1 April 2023.

8. Case Law - *Lotus & Delta Ltd v Culverwell (VO)* [1976] RA 141

Discussion

9. The appellants' representative stated that both properties were valued in the same valuation office scheme, 612220 "Industrial properties in Leicester located within these 3 areas: to the East of Abbey Lane and to the North of Dysart Way and Uppingham Road; to the West of London Road, South of the Inner Ring Road and to the East of the River Soar (excluding the

Freemen's common estate); and within the Frog Island, St Margarets Way, Parker Drive and Abbey Meadows area. Units usually built from 1980 to 1989".

10. The only issue contested was that of the unadjusted rate being excessive on both properties. The evidence folder he had submitted was the same for both subject properties.

11. He referred to the rents on the subject properties in accordance with the hierarchy as outlined in the *Lotus and Delta v Culverwell* case.

12. 23 New Star Road was held on a lease originally from 2013 but reviewed on 2 February 2019 at £65,000 per annum. Using an In Terms of Main Space (ITMS) area of 1,382.77m^2 this rent analysed to £40.25/m^2 compared to the adopted tone of £40/m^2. Whilst this rent was a review and set two years prior to the AVD, he attached little weight but felt that it showed that the adopted tone was on the high side.

13. 19 and 21 New Star Road was let on a lease on 1 March 2022, eleven months after the AVD, for £70,000 per annum. Using an ITMS of 2,080.15m^2 and including the current 5% end allowance he had analysed this to £35.42/m^2 compared to the current adopted tone of £40/m^2 and he contended that this was very good evidence for a reduction in the unadjusted rate for the subject property. This also showed that there had been a nil uplift in the value of the subject property from the 2017 assessment.

14. In the main, he contended that the 2022 rent on 19 and 21 New Star Road was the best evidence supporting a reduction for both subject properties to £35.50/m^2 for 19 and 21 New Star Road and £40/m^2 for 23 New Star Road.

15. In his opinion, the comparable properties submitted by the LO were not generally comparable except for the property at 37 Morris Road. This was in the same scheme as the subject properties and was held on a renewed lease from 1 September 2021, five months after the AVD, at £50,380 per annum. He had analysed this rent on an ITMS of 1,382.10m^2 to £36.64/m^2.

16. The VO's representative stated that this property was 3.9 miles from the subject properties and its lower rental analysis did not establish a lower valuation in isolation. He referred to the case of *Specialeyes Ltd v Felgate (VO)* [1994] RA 338 where lower weight was to be given due to it being hindsight evidence.

17. He had also referred to the rent on the subject property but stated that he did not have any further information but felt that as there was a limited adjustment and analysis it was reasonable to consider a wider scope of comparable evidence in assessing the subject properties.

18. He referred to the property Sign Fab, Byford Road which was older and slightly smaller than 19 and 21 New Star Road. It had been let on a lease renewal three months prior to the AVD and the rent analysed to £43.19m^2 and was therefore supportive of £40/m^2 for 19 and 21 New Star Road.

19. The VO's representative had also submitted two properties that he felt supported the valuations of both subject properties.

20. 10 – 12 &16 Lunsford Road was 1.4 miles from the subject properties and within a similar aged industrial location. Whilst the form of return stated that the rent review was between connected parties it was determined at open-market value five months prior to the AVD. The rent analysed to £65.81/m^2 and he felt this was a reasonable comparable. Units 2 -5 & 7 Knighton Junction Lane had been let on a lease renewal over two years prior to the AVD and he had analysed the rent to £61.25/m^2.

21. The appellants' representative had given low weight to both of these properties as the rent was either between connected parties or was too far removed from the AVD.

22. The panel noted the comments of both parties.

23. In respect of 23 New Star Road the VO's representative had submitted 19 Progress Way which was in a similar industrial locality only 475m away. It had been let on a lease renewal five and a half months prior to the AVD and he had analysed the rent to £51.37/m^2 which supported the rate of £45/m^2. In his opinion, this was the strongest evidence supporting the current rate.

24. Overall, the panel found that there was a wide variety of evidence submitted with allowances to be made for properties of slightly different sizes, in different localities and of rents not always at or around the AVD.

25. In respect of the rent on 19 and 21 New Star Road the panel found that it seemed to be an outlier and was not persuaded that it had significant weight as further details of the rent in 2022 had not been submitted. The panel therefore found that it was required to look at the wider evidence.

26. The panel found that the properties at 10 – 12 & 16 Lunsford Road, Units 2 -5 & 7 Knighton Junction Lane, whilst considering their differences, had analysed rents significantly higher than £40/m^2 and therefore supported the current valuation. The panel found that the analysed rent for Sign Fab, Byford Road of £43.19/m^2 for an older property and within a different scheme still supported a value of £40/m^2.

27. The panel noted that the appellants representative had further relied on a recent 2023 challenge settlement on the property at Forward House, 185 Thurncoat Road, an industrial unit where the rate of £55/m^2 was reduced to £40.08/m^2. This property was significantly smaller than 19 and 21 New Star Road at only roughly a quarter of the size and was not similar in appearance or locality. The panel found that it was not comparable and gave it little weight.

28. In respect of 23 New Star Road the panel found that the property at 19 Progress Way was in close proximity to the appeal property but smaller and its rent had analysed to £51.37/m^2 on a rent less than six months after the AVD. The panel found that this supported the current valuation of £45/m^2.

Decision

29. In conclusion, the panel found that no evidence had been presented that supported a reduction in the unadjusted rate of either of the subject properties.

30. The appeals were therefore dismissed.

Right of further appeal

31. 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.

32. 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/.

Mr JP Percival, Senior Member (Chair)
Mrs N Carman, Senior Member

Mr D Adamson
Clerk to the Tribunal
Date issued to the parties: 8 October 2026