



LRA/185/2007

LRA/29,38,39,51,55,59,72,73,78,91,92,109,110,111,112,113,114,117,124,141 & 142/2008

LANDS TRIBUNAL ACT 1949

LEASEHOLD ENFRANCHISEMENT – houses – price – whether Sportelli guidance applies to valuations under section 9(1)– whether deferment rate in the West Midlands area and under section 9(1) different from Sportelli generic rate – capitalisation rate – appeals on deferment rate allowed – deferment rate reduced from 5.5% to 5.0% – Leasehold Reform Act, 1967, section 9(1)

**IN THE MATTER OF TWENTY-TWO APPEALS AGAINST DECISIONS
OF THE LEASEHOLD VALUATION TRIBUNAL OF THE
MIDLAND RENT ASSESSMENT PANEL**

BY

- (1) MANSAL SECURITIES LTD**
 - (2) JGS PROPERTIES LTD**
 - (3) SIDEWALK PROPERTIES LTD**
 - (4) TRUSTEES OF THE CALTHORPE
EDGBASTON ESTATE**
 - (5) BUSINESS FLATS LTD**
 - (6) DENETOWER LTD**
 - (7) SOUNDMANOR LTD**
 - (8) LINECROFT LTD**
 - (9) D G LEWIS ESTATES LTD**
- (No Respondents)**

Appellants

**Re: 512 Haslucks Green Road
Shirley
Solihull
B90 1DN
and
21 other houses in the West Midlands**

Before: N J Rose FRICS

**Sitting at Procession House, 110 New Bridge Street, London, EC4V 6JL
on 29 January 2009**

© CROWN COPYRIGHT 2009

Anthony Radevsky, instructed by Boodle Hatfield, solicitors of London for the Calthorpe Edgbaston Estate; by Cottons, chartered surveyors of Edgbaston, by direct professional access for Mansal Securities Ltd, JGS Properties Ltd, Business Flats Ltd, Soundmanor Ltd, Denric Securities Ltd and D G Lewis Estates Ltd; and by Nick Plotnek Associates of Harborne, by direct professional access for Sidewalk Properties Ltd, Denetower Ltd and Linecroft Ltd.

The following cases are referred to in this decision:

Cadogan v Sportelli [2007] 1 EGLR 153
Cadogan v Sportelli [2008] 1 WLR 2142
Farr v Millersons Investments Ltd (1971) 22 P & CR, 1060
Nicholson v Goff [2007] 1 EGLR 83
Cik v Chavda LRA/111/2007 (unreported)
Official Custodian of Charities v Goldridge (1973) 26 P & CR 191
Wilkes v Larcroft Properties [1983] 2 EGLR 94
Hildron Finance Ltd v Greenhill Hampstead Ltd
Daejan Investments Ltd v The Holt (Freehold) Ltd LRA/133/2006 (unreported)
Sir Charles Christian Nicholson Bart and others LRA/29/2006 (unreported)

The following cases were also cited:

Adams v Ward LON/LVT/2043/06 (unreported)
Tsiapkinis v Cadogan LRA/59/2006 (unreported)

DECISION

Introduction

1. These are twenty-two appeals, made by the freeholders and heard together, against decisions by the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal of the Midland Rent Assessment Panel involving valuations under section 9(1) of the Leasehold Reform Act 1967 (the 1967 Act). In each case the LVT applied a deferment rate of 5.5 per cent in valuing the freehold interest. The appellants consider that the LVT should have used a rate of 4.75 per cent, the figure determined for houses by this Tribunal in *Cadogan v Sportelli* [2007] 1 EGLR 153 and approved by the Court of Appeal [2008] 1 WLR 2142 to the extent that it related to houses in the Prime Central London area (PCL). The LVT gave permission to appeal to this Tribunal in each case. None of the leaseholders responded to the appeals.

2. In one case, relating to 25 Inchford Road, Solihull, there is also an appeal against the LVT's use of a rate of 6 per cent when capitalising the ground rent during the term of the existing lease. The appellant contends that the correct capitalisation rate should be 5.25 per cent.

3. Details of the appellants, their properties, the leaseholders, the prices determined by the LVT and those suggested by the appellants' expert witness are set out in the attached schedule (Appendix 1).

4. Mr Anthony Radevsky of counsel appeared for the appellants. He called one expert witness, Mr K F Davis FRICS, who holds among other positions that of a consultant to Messrs Cottons, chartered surveyors of Birmingham.

5. The 22 houses with which this decision is concerned are all situated in the West Midlands conurbation. They vary in size, type and class, offering a broad spectrum of family accommodation. The respective freehold vacant possession values determined by the LVT, against which there is no appeal, and the unexpired lease terms are as follows:

	Address	Value	Unexpired Term
512	Haslucks Green Road	£240,000	57 years
25	Inchford Road	£325,000	68 years
89	Rowood Drive	£180,000	57 years
38	Rowood Drive	£180,000	56 years
19	Ingham Way	£230,000	56 years
93	Reindeer Road	£175,000	57 years
78	Old Oscott Hill	£130,000	24 years
5	Greenslade Road	£231,000	58 years
5	Elmwood Rise	£225,000	55 years
17	Belmont Close	£145,000	67 years

213	Nuthurst Road	£127,500	44 years
70	Greenacres Road	£145,000	27 years
98	Reindeer Road	£175,000	57 years
7	Barford Close	£152,500	61 years
61	Maisemore Close	£177,500	69 years
8	Northfield Close	£150,000	73 years
15	Latchford Close	£240,000	72 years
89	Donnington Close	£132,000	65 years
30	Beech Avenue	£180,000	25 years
7	Farriers Mill	£140,000	89 years
64	Pooley View	£195,000	57 years
77	Pooley View	£175,000	57 years

Case for the appellants

6. Mr Davis said that, in deciding which deferment rate was appropriate, the starting point must be the guidance given by the Lands Tribunal in *Sportelli*. The fact that *Sportelli* concerned a valuation under section 9(1A) of the 1967 Act and not section 9(1) was immaterial. Under section 9(1) the initial reversion was to an extended lease for a term of 50 years at a high modern ground rent. That rent was fixed by reference to the capital value of the land and the house standing upon it. There was no logical reason why the deferment rate under section 9(1) should differ from that applicable under section 9(1A), where the reversion was to both the land and the building.

7. In *Sportelli* it was explained that the deferment rate was made up of three elements – the risk free rate, the real growth rate and the risk premium. The risk free rate must be the same under section 9(1) and section 9(1A). The real growth rate must also be the same. If anything land values were more secure than house values. In some of the instant cases the LVT had suggested that real growth rates were expected to be lower in the West Midlands than in Central London. That view had not been supported by evidence and had not been quantified by the LVT. It was no more than a hunch. Indeed, in recent decisions under the 1993 Act, relating to flats at Kelton Court, Edgbaston and 24 Whittington Grove, Stechford, the LVT had rejected the leaseholders' argument that the 5% rate set for flats in *Sportelli* should be varied because a different risk premium was applicable to Birmingham.

8. In each of the current cases the LVT had concluded that the risk premium should be higher under section 9(1) because of the relative advantage of potential vacant possession on expiry in a case under section 9(1A). Mr Davis did not agree. The purchaser of a section 9(1A) reversion, if available, would be acquiring a high value house. The hypothetical investor would consider that this would be putting too many eggs in one basket. A section 9(1) freehold, on the other hand, would appeal to smaller investors, who would be attracted by the increase in value as the unexpired term reduced, together with a potential increase in house values.

9. What had to be identified (if it existed) was a factor within the risk premium which would lead to a different conclusion being reached under section 9(1) than under section 9(1A). It was clear from *Sportelli* that the factors making up the risk premium were volatility, illiquidity, deterioration and obsolescence. There was no evidence or other reason to suppose that the rental value of a site was more volatile than the value of the house and site together. Nor was a reversion to a site more illiquid than a reversion to a house and site. The reversionary element was tradeable, whether it was to vacant possession value or to an income stream. A site was, if anything, less likely to deteriorate than a house and (unlike a house) would not be subject to obsolescence. If anything, therefore, there was a case for a lower deferment rate under section 9(1), although the appellants were content to seek the same rate.

10. Mr Davis had never seen a section 9(1A) ground rent offered for sale. On the other hand there was a strong market for freehold ground rents secured on houses and flats. This demand had increased over the past 10 to 15 years. He produced details of the prices achieved by Messrs Cottons at auction in October 2008 for section 9(1) freehold ground rent investments in Dudley. The auctioneers' analysis showed that the price paid reflected a deferment rate below 4.75%.

Discussion and conclusions

11. Many of the LVTs whose decisions form the subject of these appeals considered that *Sportelli* did not provide the appropriate starting point for valuations under section 9(1). Their general approach is summarised in the following passage from the decision on 30 Beech Avenue:

“We note the Members in *Sportelli* (LT) at para 8 say ‘Nothing that is said in this decision has any direct application to capitalisation rates.’ The question before us is the appropriate deferred capitalisation rate, namely a capitalisation rate, not a deferment rate, as it is the capitalisation rate which is deferred not a capital sum.”

12. I do not think that is a correct analysis of the position. In arriving at the price payable it is necessary for the valuer to ascertain the section 15 modern ground rent and then to capitalise that rent, deferred for the unexpired term of the existing term. The modern ground rent will be payable for 50 years, and be subject to review after 25 years. However, the generally recognised method of approach is to capitalise the section 15 rent as if in perpetuity, deferred for the period of the unexpired term of the existing tenancy; not seeking to quantify any different rent that might become substituted at the expiration of twenty five years from the original term date, and not quantifying separately the value in reversion at the expiration of fifty years from the original term date (see *Farr v Millersons Investments Ltd* (1971) 22 P & CR at 1060, CA).

13. In every one of the 22 cases under consideration, the LVT used the same percentage, 5½, when decapitalising the site value to arrive at the modern ground rent as it did when capitalising and deferring that rent. It has not been suggested that they were wrong to do so. Indeed, in para 9-11 of *Hague on Leasehold Enfranchisement*, Fourth Edition, the learned editors state:

“It is settled (*Official Custodian of Charities v Goldridge* (1973) 26 P & CR 191, CA; *Wilkes v Larcroft Properties* [1983] 2 EGLR 94, CA) that, in the absence of any evidence to contrary effect, the percentage rate to be adopted for capitalisation and deferment should be the same rate as that adopted for decapitalising the site value to ascertain the section 15 rent.”

14. The effect of this approach is that, whilst in theory the valuer is capitalising a ground rent payable on reversion, in practice he is deferring a capital sum – the site value – receivable on the termination of the existing lease. In those circumstances, any guidance on the deferment rate given by this Tribunal in *Sportelli*, which the Court of Appeal held should be followed by LVTs, is to be followed in cases under section 9(1) as well as in those under section 9(1A).

15. In *Sportelli* the Tribunal concluded that the generic deferment rate should be 4.75% (para 79), that this should be increased by 0.25% for flats (para 95) and that these rates were constant beyond 20 years (para 85). In para 123 the Tribunal observed:

“The application of the deferment rate of 5% for flats and 4.75% for houses that we have found to be generally applicable will need to be considered in relation to the facts of each individual case. Before applying a rate that is different from this, however, a valuer or an LVT should be satisfied that there are particular features that fall outside the matters that are reflected in the vacant possession value of the house or flat or in the deferment rate itself and can be shown to make a departure from the rate appropriate.”

16. In the Court of Appeal Carnwath LJ agreed that this general guidance was indeed appropriate. At para 99 he said:

“I agree with the Tribunal that an important part of its role is to promote consistent practice in land valuation matters. It was entirely appropriate for the Tribunal to offer guidance as they have done in this case, and, unless and until the legislature intervenes, to expect leasehold valuation tribunals to follow generally that lead.”

17. This approval by the Court of Appeal, however, was qualified. In paragraph 102 Carnwath LJ said this:

“The Tribunal’s later comments on the significance of their guidance do not distinguish in terms between the PCL area and other parts of London or the country. However, there must in my view be an implicit distinction. The issues within the PCL were fully examined in a fully contested dispute between directly interested parties. The same cannot be said in respect of other areas. The judgment that the same deferment rate should apply outside the PCL area was made, and could only be made, on the evidence then available. That must leave the way open to the possibility of further evidence being called by other parties in other cases directly concerned with different areas. The deferment rate adopted by the Tribunal will no doubt be the starting point; and their conclusions on the methodology, including the limitations of market evidence, are likely to remain valid. However, it is possible to envisage other

evidence being called, for example, on issues relevant to the risk premium for residential property in different areas. That will be a matter for those advising future parties, and for the tribunals, to consider as such issues arise.”

18. Although, in each of the appeals now under consideration, the LVT decided that the *Sportelli* generic rate of 4.75% should be revised to 5.5%, the reasons for the increase were not always the same. In all cases the increase was attributed to the distinction between the reversionary positions under section 9(1) and 9(1A). In ten cases, however, (LRA/38, 39, 59, 72, 73, 92, 109, 111, 141 and 142/2008) the LVT’s decision also reflected its conclusion that a higher rate should be adopted than that which would be appropriate in the PCL area.

19. In deciding whether a departure from the 4.75% generic rate is justified in the present appeals, therefore, two questions must be answered. Firstly, are the factors which led the Tribunal to determine 4.75% in *Sportelli* – where the Tribunal was concerned with enfranchisement pursuant to section 9(1A) of the 1967 Act and the provisions of the Leasehold Reform, Housing and Urban Development Act 1993 (the 1993 Act) – sufficiently different from those which would apply in valuations under section 9(1)? Secondly, is there any evidence to justify a deferment rate for houses in the West Midlands which is different from that applying to houses in the PCL area?

20. I consider firstly the difference between sections 9(1) and 9(1A). As Mr Davis pointed out, the Tribunal in *Sportelli* found that it needed to establish three components of the deferment rate. The first was the risk-free rate, defined as the return demanded by investors for holding an asset with no risk, often proxied by the return on a government security held to redemption. The Tribunal concluded that this rate should be 2.25%. Mr Davis considered that the risk-free rate should be the same under sections 9(1) and 9(1A) and I see no reason to disagree.

21. The second component of the deferment rate was the real growth in house prices. On this the Tribunal concluded that:

“a realistic, or neutral, assumption would be 2%, with any concern on the part of the investor that this rate might not be achieved being reflected in the risk premium”.

Again, Mr Davis’s opinion, that there was no justification for adopting a different growth rate depending on whether the reversion was to site value or building value, seems to me to be entirely reasonable.

22. The final component of the deferment rate was the risk premium, or the additional return required by investors to compensate for the risk of not receiving a guaranteed return. The Tribunal concluded that, in forming an overall assessment of the premium which would be required by investors in the type of asset it was considering, it was necessary to have regard to the individual components of the risks of investment in long reversions. These were volatility, illiquidity, deterioration and obsolescence. Of these components, the Tribunal concluded that physical deterioration and obsolescence were factors that required to be reflected in the generic

deferment rate to the extent that the risk related to them was common to all residential property viewed in the long term.

23. Mr Davis's view was that there was an argument for a lower deferment rate under section 9(1), because a site was not subject to obsolescence in the way that a house was and was less likely to deteriorate than a house. I think that Mr Davis is right on this point.

24. The remaining components of the risk premium were volatility and illiquidity. In *Sportelli* the Tribunal considered that the combined effect of these factors must have the major impact upon the risk premium. It did not think that, in the market which it had to envisage,

“there would be any significant number of investors that would be looking to hold these very long-term assets throughout their lives. The attraction of the investment would be its relative security, the prospect of growth and the opportunity for both long-term retention and earlier sale. Tradeability would, we think, be important as one of its components, and it is this that would make the volatility of the housing market and the relative illiquidity of the investment significant factors in the mind of a purchaser.”

In the Tribunal's judgment

“Since real house prices are shown to be strongly cyclical, with persistent periods of negative growth, an investor in a long-term reversion would be very conscious of the risk that the market could be depressed at the point at which he wished to sell his interest, even though, as compared with equities, the residential property market is rather less volatile. Reversions would suffer, in comparison with equities, from illiquidity resulting from high transaction costs and the length of time to complete a transaction. The latter factor would, we think, be perceived as adding substantially to the risk associated with volatility.”

25. The Tribunal concluded that the market for house reversions would require a risk premium of 4.5%. Combined with a risk-free rate of 2.25% and a real growth rate of 2%, this produced the generic deferment rate of 4.75%.

26. In Mr Davis's opinion the rental value of a site was no more volatile than the capital value of a house and a reversion to a site was not more illiquid than one to a house. I am unable to accept that conclusion. Ground rental value is the annual equivalent of site value. The latter is the amount which remains after building and other development costs (including an allowance for profit) are deducted from the value of the completed building. The nature of such a residual calculation means that a gearing effect operates. An increase in the estimated value of the completed house is likely to result in a more than proportionate increase in the residual site value and vice versa. There would be a corresponding increase in the risk were the market to be depressed when the investor decided to sell. There might also be a resultant increase in the time needed to achieve a sale of such an investment.

27. Since the reversion in the case of section 9(1) is to a ground rent only, a potential purchaser is likely to require a higher risk premium to compensate for the increased volatility and illiquidity than if the reversion also included a house standing on the site. The increased risk would, however, be offset to some extent by the reduced risk of deterioration and obsolescence. I find that the overall result would be to increase the risk premium to 4.75% and thus to increase the deferment rate to 5%.

28. I turn to the effect on the deferment rate of the location of the appeal properties. In paragraph 88 of *Sportelli*, to which Carnwath LJ was referring in his remarks quoted in para 17 above, the Tribunal said:

“Although we accept the view of the valuers that the deferment rate could require adjustment for location, on the evidence before us we see no justification for making any adjustment to reflect regional or local considerations either generally or in relation to the particular cases before us. The evidence of the financial experts suggests that no adjustment to the real growth rate is appropriate given the long-term basis of the deferment rate, and locational differences of a local nature are, in the absence of clear evidence suggesting otherwise, to be assumed to be properly reflected in the freehold vacant possession value.”

29. Since those observations were made in the Court of Appeal the Tribunal has had to consider the appropriate deferment rate to be adopted in four cases outside the PCL area where the existing term exceeded 20 years unexpired. All four decisions related to enfranchisements under the 1993 Act, not the 1967 Act. In *Hildron Finance Ltd v Greenhill Hampstead Ltd* [2008] 1 EGLR 179 the Tribunal (Judge Reid QC and N J Rose FRICS) decided that there was no justification for departing from the *Sportelli* deferment rate of 5% when valuing a block of flats in Hampstead. The same conclusion was reached in *Daejan Investments Ltd v The Holt (Freehold) Ltd* LRA/133/2006, unreported, (Judge Huskinson and A J Trott FRICS), concerning a block of flats in the London Borough of Merton and in *Cik v Chavda and others* LRA/111/2007, unreported, (George Bartlett, QC, President and P R Francis FRICS) which related to a block of flats in Hounslow, Middlesex. The fourth case, *Sir Charles Christian Nicholson Bart and others (No Respondent)* LRA/29/2006, unreported, was concerned with a purpose-built development of ground floor retail shops and eleven flats above in Calthorpe Road, Edgbaston. The Tribunal (The President and A J Trott FRICS) again held that there were no special factors that would make it appropriate to adopt a deferment rate other than 5% for the lease of one flat with 25 years unexpired.

30. Mr Davis considered that there was no justification for departing from the *Sportelli* deferment rate of 4.75% when valuing the appeal properties in order to reflect their location in the West Midlands. I drew his attention to the first instance decision concerning 30 Beech Avenue, where the LVT had been provided with average house price figures compiled by the Nationwide Building Society for Inner London and the West Midlands. These suggested that, in the fourth quarter of 1952, the ratio between the two was 1.37 to 1. This had increased to 1.84 to 1 by the fourth quarter of 2007. Mr Davis replied that no reliance could be placed on figures from only one source.

31. In its decision on 30 Beech Avenue, the LVT said:

“We find we should be cautious in relying solely on a mathematical analysis and extrapolation of statistical trends, because valuation is an art, not a science, involving an element of judgment; and particularly because, in the case before us, Mr Moyle’s method includes subjective adjustments and relies on statistics (Nationwide statistics) which have, over 56 years, been derived from figures which are weighted and the weighting has been changed on four occasions; further, it is admitted the statistics include dissimilar types of houses and may even include studio flats. As we say earlier ... the greater the number of adjustments the less reliable is the evidence; the adjustments in Mr Moyle’s calculations are numerous. Hence we are cautious.”

Having thus warned itself against relying on the Nationwide statistics, the LVT nevertheless concluded that the real growth rate for property in the West Midlands had been less than in PCL.

32. If it was right to draw conclusions from a single set of figures, the Nationwide statistics strongly suggest that, over a period of some 55 years, house price growth was significantly slower in the West Midlands than in Central London. I do not consider, however, that this information on its own is sufficient to justify an increase in the generic deferment rate for houses in the West Midlands. As the LVT pointed out, the Nationwide statistics had been derived from weighted figures and the weighting had been changed on four occasions. They also included dissimilar types of houses and studio flats. I do not have enough information to be able to decide whether these factors materially affect the conclusion to be drawn from the statistics. Moreover, before one could be drawn it would also be necessary to ascertain whether a different pattern emerged if one looked at movements over a 50 year period commencing in different years and in different quarters between, say, 1952 and 1957 (see *Hildron*, para 39).

33. There is therefore insufficient evidence before me to displace the *Sportelli* rate of 4.75% on the grounds of location. I was told, however, that a significant number of other cases are awaiting the outcome of these appeals. In those circumstances it is appropriate for me to emphasise that the conclusions I have reached on this occasion have necessarily been arrived at without the benefit of expert evidence on behalf of the leaseholders. They have also been made with inadequate information about the Nationwide statistics and without knowing whether any other relevant statistics exist. Valuers who give evidence in similar cases in the future – whether before the LVT or the Lands Tribunal – will no doubt bear in mind their professional duty to investigate as fully as possible the matters to which I have referred before forming a conclusion as to whether the first impression that I have obtained from the Nationwide statistics fairly reflects past patterns of growth.

34. I am also concerned with an appeal against the capitalisation rate of 6% determined by the LVT in respect of 25 Inchford Road. In this case the valuation date was 7 June 2007. At that date the annual ground rent was £75, rising to £150 in 2009 and £300 from 2042 until the termination of the lease in 2075.

35. Mr Davis said that the factors to be taken into account in setting the capitalisation rate were length of lease, security of recovery, size of ground rent and the provision for and nature of the rent review. The current ground rent was not nominal, it was due to double in June 2009 and to double again in 2042. The amounts of rent payable were fixed and there should be no problem in collecting them. It was common to pay this type of ground rent by standing order.

36. In Mr Davis's opinion it would be correct to associate the capitalisation rate used with the rate obtainable from a High Street bank or building society. His report was dated 23 September 2008. At that date, he said, rates ranged from 3% to 6.25%. He considered that this was an attractive investment linked to a reversionary interest. In his opinion the capitalisation rate to adopt was 5.25%.

37. Mr Davis said that guidance was required from the Lands Tribunal as to the capitalisation rate for an escalating ground rent with fixed increases. I would be reluctant to provide such guidance without the benefit of expert evidence from both sides, unless it is absolutely necessary to do so. In this case Mr Davis has failed to satisfy me that his suggested rate of 5.25% is more reliable than the LVT's 6%, given that both figures fall within his quoted range of 3% to 6.25%. In any event I would need to be persuaded that those rates – which are presumably paid for short terms deposits – are relevant to the valuation of a fixed interest security with 68 years unexpired.

38. I determine that the deferment rate to be used in valuing the 22 appeal properties should be 5%. The appeals on the deferment rate succeed. The appeal against the capitalisation rate used by the LVT in the case of 25 Inchford Road fails. The prices payable for the enfranchisement of the appeal properties are set out below. The relevant calculations appear in Appendix 2.

Address	
512 Haslucks Green Road, Shirley, Solihull, B90 1DN	£5,549
25 Inchford Road, Solihull, B92 9QD	£7,533
89 Rowood Drive, Damsonwood, Solihull, B92 9NN	£4,163
38 Rowood Drive, Damsonwood, Solihull, B92 9LU	£4,755
19 Ingham Way, Harborne, Birmingham, B17 8SW	£6,323
93 Reindeer Road, Tamworth, B78 3SW	£4,199
78 Old Oscott Hill, Birmingham, B44 9SP	£13,767
5 Greenslade Road, Sedgley, Dudley, DY3 3QL	£5,578
5 Elmwood Rise, Sedgley, Dudley, DY3 3QJ	£5,233
17 Belmont Close, Tipton, DY4 9PJ	£2,881
213 Nuthurst Road, Birmingham, B31 4TG	£4,770
70 Greenacres Road, Kings Norton, Birmingham, B38 8NH	£12,899
98 Reindeer Road, Fazeley, Tamworth, B78 3SP	£4,154
7 Barford Close, Redditch, B98 0BA	£3,521
61 Maisemore Close, Redditch, B98 9LN	£2,783
8 Northfield Close, Redditch, B98 9NJ	£2,353
15 Latchford Close, Redditch, B98 9NQ	£3,714
89 Donnington Close, Redditch, B98 8QE	£2,683
30 Beech Avenue, Quinton, Birmingham, B32 2UB	£17,828

7 Farriers Mill, Pelsall, Walsall, WS3 4QZ	£2,121
64 Pooley View, Polesworth, B78 1BP	£4,544
77 Pooley View, Polesworth, B78 1BT	£4,087

Dated 24 February 2009

N J Rose FRICS

Appendix 1

Ref	Address	Freeholder	Leaseholder	LVT Valuation	Appellants' Valuation
LRA/185/2007	512 Haslucks Green Road, Shirley, Solihull, B90 1DN	Mansal Securities Ltd	John Thomas Henry Evans and Janet Pamela Evans	£4,480	£6,472
LRA/29/2008	25 Inchford Road, Solihull, B92 9QD	JGS Properties Ltd	Frank Michael Butler and Linda Diane Butler	£5,832	£8,365
LRA/38/2008	89 Rowood Drive, Damsonwood, Solihull, B92 9NN	Sidewalk Properties Ltd	Mrs P M Swann	£3,334	£4,720
LRA/39/2008	38 Rowood Drive, Damsonwood, Solihull, B92 9LU	Sidewalk Properties Ltd	Mr P J and Mrs M Fidoe	£3,560	£5,014
LRA/51/2008	19 Ingham Way, Harborne, Birmingham, B17 8SW	The Calthorpe Edgbaston Estate	Jasvinder Singh Deol	£4,613	£6,694
LRA/55/2008	93 Reindeer Road, Tamworth, B78 3SW	Sidewalk Properties Ltd	Karl David Lakin	£3,369	£4,807
LRA/59/2008	78 Old Oscott Hill, Birmingham, B44 9SP	Business Flats Ltd	Ms Kathleen June Harris	£12,134	£14,412
LRA/72/2008	5 Greenslade Road, Sedgley, Dudley, DY3 3QL	Sidewalk Properties Ltd	Mr P H Ashwood and Mrs D Ashwood	£4,129	£6,046
LRA/73/2008	5 Elmwood Rise, Sedgley, Dudley, DY3 3QJ	Sidewalk Properties Ltd	Mr W R S Duggan and Mrs M J Duggan	£4,523	£6,539
LRA/78/2008	17 Belmont Close, Tipton, DY4 9PJ	Denetower Ltd	Michael John Wilson and Dianne Lynne Wilson	£2,227	£3,044
LRA/91/2008	213 Nuthurst Road, Birmingham, B31 4TG	Soundmanor Ltd	Mr R A A Unwin	£3,966	£5,423
LRA/92/2008	70 Greenacres Road, Kings Norton, Birmingham, B38 8NH	Business Flats Ltd	Barry Dean and Brian Dean	£11,394	£13,844
LRA/109/2008	98 Reindeer Road, Fazeley, Tamworth, B78 3SP	Sidewalk Properties Ltd	Mr P A Chubb	£3,374	£4,827
LRA/110/2008	7 Barford Close, Redditch, B98 0BA	Sidewalk Properties Ltd	Mr and Mrs D M Chilton	£2,831	£3,882
LRA/111/2008	61 Maisemore Close, Redditch, B98 9LN	Sidewalk Properties Ltd	Mr P Atherley and Mrs C L Atherley	£2,404	£3,361

Ref	Address	Freeholder	Leaseholder	LVT Valuation	Appellants' Valuation
LRA/112/2008	8 Northfield Close, Redditch, B98 9NJ	Sidewalk Properties Ltd	Mr I R Sweeney and Miss K Richards	£1,850	£2,546
LRA/113/2008	15 Latchford Close, Redditch, B98 9NQ	Sidewalk Properties Ltd	Mr A G Gilbert and Mrs S M Gilbert	£2,930	£4,193
LRA/114/2008	89 Donnington Close, Redditch, B98 8QE	Sidewalk Properties Ltd	Deborah Ann Boucher	£2,200	£3,012
LRA/117/2008	30 Beech Avenue, Quinton, Birmingham, B32 2UB	Denric Securities Ltd	Brian Hemming	£15,710	£18,827
LRA/124/2008	7 Farriers Mill, Pelsall, Walsall, WS3 4QZ	Linecroft Ltd	Mr D E Cox and Ms L J Cox	£2,051	£2,410
LRA/141/2008	64 Pooley View, Polesworth, B78 1BP	D G Lewis Estates Ltd	Mr S J Scarsbrook and Mrs E A Scarsbrook	£3,590	£5,184
LRA/142/2008	77 Pooley View, Polesworth, B78 1BT	D G Lewis Estates Ltd	Miss Paula Clare Aldred	£3,194	£4,612

VALUATIONS BY LANDS TRIBUNAL

LRA/185/2007

512 Haslucks Green Road, Shirley, Solihull, B90 1 DN**Term**

Capitalised ground rent (not appealed) £ 509

Reversion

Site value (not appealed)	£84,000	
PV £1 deferred 57 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.06</u>	<u>£5,040</u>
		<u>£5,549</u>

LRA/29/2008

25 Inchford Road, Solihull, B92 9QD**Term**

Ground rent capitalised @ 6.0% per LVT decision £2,593

Reversion

Site value (not appealed)	£123,500	
PV £1 deferred 68 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.04</u>	<u>£4,940</u>
		<u>£7,533</u>

LRA/38/2008

89 Rowood Drive, Damsonwood, Solihull, B92 9NN**Term**

Capitalised ground rent (not appealed) £ 599

Reversion

Site value (not appealed)	£59,400	
PV £1 deferred 57.5 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.06</u>	<u>£3,564</u>
		<u>£4,163</u>

LRA/39/2008

38 Rowood Drive, Damsonwood, Solihull, B92 9LU**Term**

Capitalised ground rent (not appealed) £ 597

Reversion

Site value (not appealed)	£59,400	
PV £1 deferred 56 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.07</u>	<u>£4,158</u>
		<u>£4,755</u>

LRA/51/2008
19 Ingham Way, Harborne, Birmingham, B17 8SW

Term

Capitalised ground rent (not appealed) £ 373

Reversion

Site value (not appealed)	£85,000	
PV £1 deferred 56 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.07</u>	<u>£5,950</u>
		<u>£6,323</u>

LRA/55/2008
93 Reindeer Road, Fazeley, Tamworth, B78 3SW

Term

Capitalised ground rent (not appealed) £ 524

Reversion

Site value (not appealed)	£61,250	
PV £1 deferred 57.33 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.06</u>	<u>£3,675</u>
		<u>£4,199</u>

LRA/59/2008
78 Old Oscott Hill, Great Barr, Birmingham, B44 9SP

Term

Capitalised ground rent (not appealed) £ 65

Reversion

Site value (not appealed)	£44,200	
PV £1 deferred 24.25 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.31</u>	<u>£13,702</u>
		<u>£13,767</u>

LRA/72/2008
5 Greenslade Road, Sedgley, Dudley, DY3 3QL

Term

Capitalised ground rent (not appealed) £ 450

Reversion

Site value (not appealed)	£85,470	
PV £1 deferred 58.75 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.06</u>	<u>£5,128</u>
		<u>£5,578</u>

LRA/73/2008
5 Elmwood Rise, Sedgley, Dudley, DY3 3QJ

Term

Capitalised ground rent (not appealed) £ 373

Reversion

Site value (not appealed)	£81,000	
PV £1 deferred 55.5 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.06</u>	<u>£4,860</u>
		<u>£5,233</u>

LRA/78/2008
17 Belmont Close, Tipton, DY4 9PJ

Term

Capitalised ground rent (not appealed) £ 909

Reversion

Site value (not appealed)	£49,300	
PV £1 deferred 67.67 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.04</u>	<u>£1,972</u>
		<u>£2,881</u>

LRA/91/2008
213 Nuthurst Road, Birmingham, B31 4TG

Term

Capitalised ground rent (not appealed) £ 95

Reversion

Site value (not appealed)	£42,500	
PV £1 deferred 44.75 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.11</u>	<u>£4,675</u>
		<u>£4,770</u>

LRA/92/2008
70 Greenacres Road, Kings Norton, Birmingham, B38 8NH

Term

Capitalised ground rent (not appealed) £ 81

Reversion

Site value (not appealed)	£49,300	
PV £1 deferred 27.5 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.26</u>	<u>£12,818</u>
		<u>£12,899</u>

LRA/190/2008
98 Reindeer Road, Fazeley, Tamworth, B78 3SP

Term		
Capitalised ground rent (not appealed)		£ 479
Reversion		
Site value (not appealed)	£61,250	
PV £1 deferred 57 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.06</u>	<u>£3,675</u>
		<u>£4,154</u>

LRA/110/2008
7 Barford Close, Matchborough East, Redditch, B98 0BA

Term		
Capitalised ground rent (not appealed)		£ 929
Reversion		
Site value (not appealed)	£51,850	
PV £1 deferred 61.75 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.05</u>	<u>£2,592</u>
		<u>£3,521</u>

LRA/111/2008
61 Maisemore Close, Church Hill, Redditch, B98 9LN

Term		
Capitalised ground rent (not appealed)		£ 920
Reversion		
Site value (not appealed)	£62,125	
PV £1 deferred 69.75 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.03</u>	<u>£1,863</u>
		<u>£2,783</u>

LRA/112/2008
8 Northfield Close, Church Hill North, Redditch, B98 9NJ

Term		
Capitalised ground rent (not appealed)		£ 823
Reversion		
Site value (not appealed)	£51,000	
PV £1 deferred 73 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.03</u>	<u>£1,530</u>
		<u>£2,353</u>

LRA/113/2008
15 Latchford Close, Church Hill, Redditch, B98 9NQ

Term		
Capitalised ground rent (not appealed)		£1,050
Reversion		
Site value (not appealed)	£88,800	
PV £1 deferred 72 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.03</u>	<u>£2,664</u>
		<u>£3,714</u>

LRA/114/2008
89 Donnington Close, Church Hill, Redditch, B98 8QE

Term		
Capitalised ground rent (not appealed)		£ 888
Reversion		
Site value (not appealed)	£44,880	
PV £1 deferred 65.75 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.04</u>	<u>£1,795</u>
		<u>£2,683</u>

LRA/117/2008
30 Beech Avenue, Quinton, Birmingham, B32 2UB

Term		
Capitalised ground rent (not appealed)		£ 80
Reversion		
Site value (not appealed)	£61,200	
PV £1 deferred 25.5 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.29</u>	<u>£17,748</u>
		<u>£17,828</u>

LRA/124/2008
7 Farriers Mill, Pelsall, Walsall, WS3 4QZ

Term		
Capitalised ground rent (not appealed)		£1,645
Reversion		
Site value (not appealed)	£47,600	
PV £1 deferred 89 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.01</u>	<u>£ 476</u>
		<u>£2,121</u>

LRA/141/2008
64 Pooley View, Polesworth, B78 1BP

Term

Capitalised ground rent (not appealed) £449

Reversion

Site value (not appealed)	£68,250	
PV £1 deferred 57.5 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.06</u>	<u>£4,095</u>
		<u>£4,544</u>

LRA/142/2008
77 Pooley View, Polesworth, B78 1BT

Term

Capitalised ground rent (not appealed) £412

Reversion

Site value (not appealed)	£61,250	
PV £1 deferred 57.75 yrs @ 5.0%	<u>0.06</u>	<u>£3,675</u>
		<u>£4,087</u>