



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

Case No: CHG101297569

Sitting remotely using
Microsoft Teams

Date: 31 July 2025

SCHEDULE 11 TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE ACT 1988

RATING — Local Government Finance Act 1988 — subject property was held freehold; rental evidence on properties in the locality, weighting of evidence, appeal dismissed

**Before:
MR PJ WARD
MR I LONSDALE**

Between:

MS SHILA RAITHATHA T/A PRONTAPRINT

Appellant

- and -

**ANDREW MOULAND
(VALUATION OFFICER)**

Respondent

**Regarding:
GND FL 46 CHISWICK HIGH ROAD, LONDON, W4 1SZ
(the “subject property”)**

Mr H Seabrook of Ryan for the appellant
Mr A Aubrey for the Respondent

Hearing date: Tuesday 15 July 2025

DECISION AND STATEMENT OF REASONS

© CROWN COPYRIGHT 2025

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed. The rateable value of £23,500 based on an unadjusted price per m² of £650 was confirmed with effect from 1 April 2023.

Introduction

1. This appeal has been brought in respect of the following: an appeal was lodged by Ryan on behalf of the occupier Ms Raithatha trading as Prontaprint on 14 February 2025 against the Valuation Officer's decision of 23 January 2025.
2. Mr Seabrook 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), Mr Seabrook's declaration of truth included a statement that he was instructed under any conditional fee arrangement.
3. Mr Seabrook 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 or not the evidence supported the client's case.
4. 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 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).
5. The panel therefore considered the "expert" evidence and attached such weight to it as it saw fit.
6. Mr Aubrey was acting in the dual role of advocate and expert witness.
7. This statement of reasons is not and does not purport to be a full verbatim record of proceedings.

Issue

8. The issue concerned the price per m² to be adopted for the subject property with effect from 1 April 2023. The representative had sought a reduction from the unadjusted price per m² of £650 to £520 per m². The respondent sought the dismissal of the appeal defending the price of £650 per m².
9. The subject property was a shop and premises at the end of a parade of shops within Chiswick. It had a return frontage with Cleveland Avenue. The location was close to other shops with occupiers including barbers, pizza takeaway, dentist, hairdresser, dry cleaners and spa. The antecedent valuation date (AVD) was 1 April 2021 and the material date for this appeal was 1 April 2023.

Decision and reasons

10. Mr Seabrook stated that the appellant held the freehold for the subject property and therefore there was no rental evidence on the subject property. He considered the best evidence was that of the rent on Basement and Ground Floor 2 Chiswick High Road. This rent commenced

on 15 April 2021 and he had devalued it to £519.65 per m² and the respondent at £508.35 per m². He informed the panel that the map of the area contained in the evidence had incorrectly identified the location of 2 Chiswick High Road and confirmed that it was on the corner of Goldhawk Road.

11. Mr Seabrook referred to the respondents' comparable properties and considered the rental analysis of 48 Chiswick High Road was irrelevant as the lease was from October 2023 and therefore too remote from the AVD. He also considered that the rent for 30 Chiswick High Road would have shown some growth being some eight months after the AVD in a growing market following the Covid19 pandemic.
12. In questions Mr Seabrook confirmed that the lease for 2 Chiswick High Road was a renewal and accepted that a new letting provided more weight but that in this opinion this rental evidence held significant weight due to being very close to the AVD and close in location.
13. Mr Aubrey stated that following an inspection he had found that there was a basement and security camera system not reflected in the assessment and that he had served a notice increasing the RV but that the increase in RV was not before this hearing and that he was defending RV £23,500 for this appeal.
14. Mr Aubrey did not consider that the rateable value was unreasonable when considered with the basket of evidence which included rental and comparable evidence. He considered the best evidence was that of 50 Chiswick High Road where a new letting from August 2020 analyses to £711.04 per m². He also considered 56 Chiswick High Road likewise provided some weight and having regards to being an open ended lease together with fitting out and rent free periods analysed to £539.63 per m². He considered that the letting for 48 Chiswick High Road in October 2023 carried some weight although it was over two years from the AVD and devalued to £738.13 per m².
15. Mr Aubrey stated that 30 Chiswick High Road has been re-constituted as two separate units and together with the lease not being a full insuring and repair lease it held less weight but it still analysed to £622.54 per m².
16. Mr Aubrey did not consider 2 Chiswick High Road to be comparable as it was located in a different parade further up the Chiswick High Road and was also separated from the subject property by significant residential properties and other parades of shops.
17. The panel considered all the rental evidence presented by both parties. It considered that 2 Chiswick High Road was located a distance from the subject property with other parades of shops and residential properties between them and also the panel noted a considerable size difference between the two properties with the subject property being 56.54 m² and 2 Chiswick High Road being 158.59 m². It was also noted that the lease for 2 Chiswick High Road was a renewal. The panel, whilst accepting close to the AVD, placed lesser weight upon this comparable hereditament.
18. The panel placed lesser weight on the lease for 30 Chiswick High Road due to it being re-constituted and was not a full insuring and repairing lease. It also placed less weight on 56 Chiswick High Road as this was another renewal and was again larger at 108.26 m².
19. The panel then reviewed the remaining rents. The panel considered the best evidence was that of 50 Chiswick High Road. This was a new letting in August 2020 and devalued to £711.04 per m². This property was within the same parade as the subject property was and

only slightly larger at 65.74 m². The panel also placed some weight upon the 2023 lease of 48 Chiswick High Road, having regards to the fact that it was over two years after the AVD in a rising market and this rent analysed to £738.13 per m². From this rental evidence the panel considered that £650 per m² applied was reasonable.

20. The panel was not persuaded by the appellant's representative that the unadjusted price per m² of £650 and RV £23,500 was unreasonable. It considered the rent on 50 Chiswick High Road provided the best evidence in confirming RV £23,500. The panel accordingly dismissed the appeal.

Right of further appeal

21. 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) within **four weeks** of the date this decision and statement of reasons is issued.
22. 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 PJ Ward, Senior Member (Presiding)

Mr I Lonsdale, Senior Member

31 July 2025

Mr A Jolly
Clerk to the Tribunal

Date issued to the parties: 31 July 2025