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

Case No: 1. CHG101273418
2. CHG101273550
3. CHG101320519
4. CHG101343891

Sitting remotely using
Microsoft Teams on
16 October 2026

Date: 9 November 2026

SCHEDULE 11 TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE ACT 1988

RATING — Local Government Finance Act 1988 — multiple appeals against the accuracy of the rateable values for the hereditaments; shops and premises; two appeals allowed; two appeals allowed in part.

Before:

MR A HETHERTON
MR S GILL

Between:

1. TECHTIQUE INTERNATIONAL LTD
2. SEAN HANNA PUTNEY LIMITED
3. LOLO INVESTMENT LTD
4. TSBF PUTNEY LIMITED

Appellants

- and -

NICOLA JOHNSON
(VALUATION OFFICER)

Respondent

Regarding:

1. 104, PUTNEY HIGH STREET, LONDON, SW15 1RG
2. 108, PUTNEY HIGH STREET, LONDON, SW15 1RG
3. 124, PUTNEY HIGH STREET, LONDON, SW15 1RG
4. GND FL 135, PUTNEY HIGH STREET, LONDON, SW15 1SU
(the “subject properties”)

Mr M Parvin of Ryan Property Tax Services UK Limited for the **Appellant**
Ms L Roberts for the **Respondent**

DECISION AND STATEMENT OF REASONS

© CROWN COPYRIGHT 2026

DECISION

1. The appeals concerning 108 and 124 Putney High Street were allowed. The appeals concerning 104 and Ground Floor 135 Putney High Street were allowed-in-part.

2. The Tribunal panel determined that the rateable value (RV) of 104 Putney High Street, London, SW15 1RG should be revised to £66,000 with effect from 1 April 2023.

3. For 108 Putney High Street, London, SW15 1RG, the panel determined a revised RV of £75,500, effective from 1 April 2023.

4. The panel revised the RV of 124 Putney High Street, London, SW15 1RG to £53,500 with effect from 1 April 2023.

5. In respect of Ground Floor 135 Putney High Street, SW15 1SU, the panel determined that the revised RV should be £39,000, effective from 1 April 2023.

STATEMENT OF REASONS

Introduction

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

7. 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.

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

Techtique International Ltd – CHG101273418
104 Putney High Street, London, SW15 1RG

- Shop and premises
- Original RV £72,500 effective from 1 April 2023, based on an unadjusted rate of £1,150/m^2.
- Appellant sought a reduction to £64,000 RV based on an unadjusted rate of £1,050/m^2, and a change in the relativity used for the basement.

Sean Hanna Putney Limited – CHG101273550
108 Putney High Street, London, SW15 1RG

- Shop and premises
- Original RV £83,000 effective from 1 April 2023, based on an unadjusted rate of £1,150/m^2.
- Appellant sought a reduction to £75,500 RV based on an unadjusted rate of £1,050/m^2.

Lolo Investment Ltd – CHG101320519
124 Putney High Street, London, SW15 1RG

- Shop and premises
- Original RV £58,500 effective from 1 April 2023, based on an unadjusted rate of £1,150/m^2.
- Appellant sought a reduction to £53,500 RV based on an unadjusted rate of £1,050/m^2.

Tsbf Putney Ltd – CHG101343891
Ground Floor 135 Putney High Street, London, SW15 1SU

- Shop and premises
- Original RV £54,500 effective from 1 April 2023, based on an unadjusted rate of £1,000/m^2.
- Appellant sought a reduction to £36,250 RV based on an unadjusted rate of £660/m^2.

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

Background

10. The subject assessments were four shops and premises at 104, 108, 124 and Ground Floor 135 Putney High Street, London. Each included ground-floor retail accommodation. All had basement storage, with the exception of the accommodation assessed at 135, which was confined to the ground floor. The total floor areas recorded in the Appellants' supporting evidence are shown in the table below. The properties therefore shared the same high street location and ground-floor retail accommodation but differed in size and the extent of their storage accommodation.

Property	**Total floor area (m²)**
104 Putney High Street	139.31
108 Putney High Street	173.95
124 Putney High Street	155.90
Ground Floor 135 Putney High Street	103.23

11. The evidence submission before the panel comprised all the evidence disclosed and exchanged during challenge which included rental evidence and its analysis, and comparable assessment evidence. Before the hearing, Ms Roberts provided a legible copy of the rental summary table as the versions included in the decision notices were illegible.

12. In view of the Upper Tribunal's judgment in *Gardiner & Theobald LLP v Jackson (VO)* [2018] UKUT 0253 (LC), Mr Parvin declared that he was appearing for the four Appellants as both

advocate and expert witness and was instructed under a conditional or other success-based fee arrangement. He confirmed that he understood his duty was to the Tribunal, regardless of whether the evidence supported his clients' cases. However, he did not provide the Tribunal with a copy of his statement of truth until after the hearing concluded.

13. Ms Roberts, for the Valuation Officer, also appeared as both advocate and expert witness. She provided a statement of truth in advance of the hearing.

14. The panel accepted this expert witness evidence on the above basis as the appeal was not complex and to do otherwise would be contrary to regulation 3 (Discharge of VTE functions – general) of the Valuation Tribunal for England (Council Tax and Rating Appeals) (Procedure) Regulations 2009 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). It was therefore appropriate for the panel hearing the evidence to consider the 'expert' evidence and assess what weight, if any, to give it in the context of the matters in issue before it.

15. The parties are reminded that the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors' practice statement, *Surveyors acting as expert witnesses* (4th edition, amended February 2023), requires members acting as expert witnesses to include a signed statement of truth and the required declarations in their written expert reports. These should therefore be provided with the expert evidence submitted in advance of the hearing. The parties' attention is also drawn to the updated fifth edition, which takes effect on 30 November 2026.

Relevant Law

16. 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

17. In the cases under consideration, the panel analysed the competing evidence having regard to the authoritative guidance in *Lotus & Delta v Culverwell (VO) and Leicester City Council* [1976] RA 141.

18. The Appellants sought an unadjusted rate of £1,050/m² for 104, 108 and 124 Putney High Street, rather than £1,150/m², and £660/m² for Ground Floor 135, rather than £1,000/m². In respect of 104, the Appellant initially sought a basement storage relativity of A/20 instead of A/10, but Mr Parvin confirmed at the hearing that this was no longer disputed and that he accepted A/10.

19. Mr Parvin submitted that the most relevant rental evidence came from the two retail parades containing the appeal properties: 78–132 Putney High Street, which included 104, 108 and 124, and 119–151 Putney High Street, which included Ground Floor 135. He stated that the

stations, shopping centre and side roads affected pedestrian movement and that rents from other parades were less reliable comparisons. He argued that three of the four rents identified on each subject parade analysed below the existing valuation rates.

20. At the hearing, Mr Parvin referred to the Valuation Officer's rental summary for the first parade. Ms Roberts had analysed the rent for 104 Putney High Street, effective from 1 January 2022 to £871.95/m². For 108 Putney High Street, the rent effective 1 September 2019 analysed to £1,136.92/m², while the reduced renewal rent in 2023 analysed to a revised £1,009.61/m². He submitted that taking a midpoint between these figures indicated a rate of around £1,072/m² at the 2021 valuation date. The 29 July 2021 rent review at 124 Putney High Street analysed to £1,578.22/m², which he considered an outlier because it was considerably higher than, and unsupported by, the other rental evidence. He also referred to the 1 June 2022 new letting at Ground Floor 78–80 Putney High Street, which analysed to £865.54/m². He argued that three of the four rents analysed below the existing unadjusted rate of £1,150/m² and supported a reduction to £1,050/m².

21. In respect of the second parade, Mr Parvin referred to the new letting of the subject property, Ground Floor 135 Putney High Street, commencing on 1 April 2021, which analysed to £708.02/m². The rent review at 127 Putney High Street, effective from 28 April 2021, analysed to £975.80/m². He also referred to the letting at 151 Putney High Street from 1 June 2021, which analysed to £550.01/m², and the rent review at 125 Putney High Street, effective from 1 August 2021, which analysed to £1,138.13/m². He placed greatest weight on the two April 2021 transactions because they were on or close to the valuation date, related to properties on the same parade and included a new letting of the subject property itself. Both analysed below the existing unadjusted rate of £1,000/m². He argued that this evidence demonstrated that the existing rate was excessive and supported his proposed rate of £660/m².

22. Mr Parvin challenged the weight placed on 174 Putney High Street. He said that it was more than 200 metres from 104 Putney High Street, on a different parade and separated by side roads. He submitted that the rental evidence from the appeal properties and their own parades was more relevant. He also questioned the Valuation Officer's approach of giving less weight to stepped rents because they required adjustments.

23. Ms Roberts submitted that the existing unadjusted rates of £1,150/m² for 104, 108 and 124 Putney High Street, and £1,000/m² for Ground Floor 135 Putney High Street were reasonable. She considered the wider rental evidence along Putney High Street, taking account of transaction dates, lease terms, incentives, size and location. She placed greatest weight on the new letting at 174 Putney High Street, commencing on 1 February 2021, which analysed to £1,071.23/m², because it was an open-market transaction close to the valuation date.

24. Ms Roberts stated that she gave less weight to rents requiring substantial adjustments for stepped payments, rent-free periods or other incentives. For 104 Putney High Street, she referred to the 1 January 2022 transaction, its six-month rent-free period and the capital payment of £25,000 to the tenant. She attached medium weight to this rental evidence because the transaction post-dated the valuation date and involved incentives and adjustments. She considered the earlier rent at 108 Putney High Street useful as a check against the existing rate but attached limited weight to the rent review at 124 Putney High Street because it was inconsistent with the other evidence. She also gave less weight to the later lettings at 78–80 and 86 Putney High Street because they were further from the valuation date.

25. For Ground Floor 135 Putney High Street, Ms Roberts acknowledged that its own rent analysed below the existing rate but attached limited to medium weight to it because of the stepped payments and other adjustments required. She also referred to the letting at 151 Putney High Street, which involved a shell unit, stepped rent and a rent-free period. She considered the rent reviews at 125 and 127 Putney High Street as part of the wider evidence. Her position was that the evidence, taken as a whole, did not establish that the existing assessments were unreasonable.

26. In response to questions about 174 Putney High Street, Ms Roberts said that her inspection on 13 October 2026 indicated similar levels of pedestrian activity near the station and near the appeal properties. She confirmed that this was her first visit to Putney and that her observations covered approximately two hours. She maintained that the proximity of the letting to the valuation date justified the weight she placed on it.

27. The panel noted that 174 Putney High Street, on which the Valuation Officer placed greatest weight, was more than 200 metres from 104 Putney High Street and occupied a different location opposite Putney railway station. Its distance from the subject properties was illustrated by the fact that it fell outside the area covered by the street plan provided to the panel. The panel considered these differences in distance and location relevant when weighing this rental evidence against the evidence from the subject properties and their own parades. The panel was more persuaded by the rental evidence relied on by Mr Parvin from the same parades as the subject properties, which included rents analysing below the existing unadjusted rate of £1,150/m² for 104, 108 and 124 Putney High Street. The panel adopted an unadjusted rate of £1,050/m² for 104, 108 and 124 Putney High Street. This resulted in revised rateable values of £75,500 for 108 and £53,500 for 124, matching the reductions sought in those appeals.

28. In respect of 104 Putney High Street, the panel asked Mr Parvin whether he maintained his challenge to the basement storage relativity of A/10, given that other properties had been analysed at A/20. He confirmed that the relativity was no longer in dispute and that he accepted A/10. The panel therefore adopted the agreed relativity of A/10, valuing the basement on the same basis as it had been analysed, together with the revised unadjusted rate of £1,050/m². This resulted in a rateable value of £66,000, rather than the £64,000 initially sought by the Appellant.

29. For Ground Floor 135 Putney High Street, the panel adopted a rate of £710/m² based on the property's rental analysis. It considered that the same result could be reached by analysing the rent to a base rate of approximately £675/m², allowing for inverse quantum, and then adding 5% when valuing the property to reflect its small size. This produced a rate of approximately £710/m², consistent with valuing the property on the same basis as the rent was analysed. It was not persuaded that the £660/m² sought by the Appellant was more appropriate, as Mr Parvin had provided no explanation of how he had calculated that figure. This resulted in a revised rateable value of £39,000, rather than the £36,250 sought.

Conclusion

30. The Tribunal panel determined that a price of £1,050/m^2 in respect of 104, 108 and 124 Putney High Street was more appropriate, and that an assessment of £66,000 RV, £75,500 RV and £53,500 RV, respectively, more accurately reflected the appeal properties. The panel determined a revised unadjusted rate of £710/m^2 in respect of Ground Floor, 135 Putney

High Street, with an assessment of £39,000 RV. The panel calculated revised valuations, as shown below:

Valuation 104 Putney High Street, London SW15 1RG				**Base / Adopted Rate**	£ 1,050.00
Item	**Description**	**Area m2**	**Relativity**	**£/m2**	**Value**
1	Ground Retail Zone A	37.30	1.00	£1,050.00	£39,165.00
2	Ground Retail Zone B	31.30	0.50	£ 525.00	£16,432.50
3	Ground Retail Zone C	17.92	0.25	£ 262.50	£4,704.00
4	Ground Internal Storage	10.17	0.10	£ 105.00	£1,067.85
5	Ground Staff Toilets	-	-	£ -	-
6	Basement Internal Storage	42.62	0.10	£ 105.00	£4,475.10
				Subtotal	**£65,844.45**
Item	**Adjustments**	**Area m2**		**Price/m2**	
	Air Conditioning System	86.50		£7.00	£605.50
				Total	**£66,449.95**
				Say RV	**£66,000**

Valuation 108 Putney High Street, London, SW15 1RG				**Base / Adopted Rate**	£ 1,050.00
Item	**Description**	**Area m2**	**Relativity**	**£/m2**	**Value**
1	Ground Retail Zone A	37.48	1.00	£ 1,050.00	£39,354.00
2	Ground Retail Zone B	38.81	0.50	£ 525.00	£20,375.25
3	Ground Retail Zone C	43.79	0.25	£ 262.50	£11,494.88
4	Remaining Retail Zone	14.94	0.13	£ 131.25	£1,960.88
5	Ground Internal Storage	11.79	0.10	£ 105.00	£1,237.95
6	Basement Internal Storage	27.14	0.05	£ 52.50	£1,424.85
7	Ground Staff Toilets	-	-	£ -	-
				Subtotal	**£75,847.80**
				Total	**£75,847.80**
				Say RV	**£75,500**

Valuation 124 Putney High Street, London, SW15 1RG				Base / Adopted Rate	£ 1,050.00
Item	**Description**	**Area m2**	**Relativity**	**£/m2**	**Value**
1	Ground Retail Zone A	27.72	1.00	£ 1,050.00	£29,106.00
2	Ground Retail Zone B	25.38	0.50	£ 525.00	£13,324.50
3	Ground Retail Zone C	18.00	0.25	£ 262.50	£4,725.00
4	Remaining Retail Zone	20.52	0.13	£ 131.25	£2,693.25
5	Ground Staff Toilets	-	-	£ -	-
6	Basement Internal Storage	64.28	0.05	£ 52.50	£3,374.70
				Subtotal	**£53,223.45**
Item	**Adjustments**	**Area m2**		**Price/m2**	
	Air Conditioning System	87.00		£7.00	£609.00
				Total	**£53,832.45**
				Say RV	**£53,500**

Valuation Ground Floor, 135 Putney High Street, London SW15 1SU				Base / Adopted Rate	£ 710.00
Item	**Description**	**Area m2**	**Relativity**	**£/m2**	**Value**
1	Ground Retail Zone A	30.25	1.00	£ 710.00	£21,477.50
2	Ground Retail Zone B	29.34	0.50	£ 355.00	£10,415.70
3	Ground Retail Zone C	30.09	0.25	£ 177.50	£5,340.98
4	Remaining Retail Zone	13.55	0.13	£ 88.75	£1,202.56
				Subtotal	**£38,436.74**
Item	**Adjustments**	**Area m2**		**Price/m2**	
	Air Conditioning System	103.20		£7.00	£722.40
				Total	**£39,159.14**
				Say RV	**£39,000**

31. As a consequence of the above decision, the Tribunal panel orders the Valuation Officer to revise the 2023 Rating List entry in respect of 104 Putney High Street, London SW15 1RG to £66,000 RV, the entry for 108 Putney High Street, London SW15 1RG to £75,500 RV, the

entry for 124 Putney High Street, London SW15 1RG to £53,500 RV and the entry for Ground Floor 135 Putney High Street, London SW15 1SU to £39,000 RV all with effect from 1 April 2023, within two weeks of the date of this Order.

Right of further appeal

32. 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.

33. 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 A Hetherton, Senior Member (Chair)
Mr S Gill, Member
9 November 2026

Mrs K Edhouse-Thomas
Clerk to the Tribunal
Date issued to the parties: 9 November 2026