Appeal No. VA01/1/093

AN BINSE LUACHÁLA

VALUATION TRIBUNAL

AN tACHT LUACHÁLA, 1988

VALUATION ACT, 1988

William Carroll

APPELLANT

and

Commissioner of Valuation

RESPONDENT

RE: Hotel and Land at Map Reference; 9.12.13AaB.14a, Townland; Whitecastle Lower, ED; Knocktopher, RD; Thomastown County Kilkenny.

B E F O R E Henry Abbott - Senior Counsel

Chairman

John Kerr - MIAVI

Member

Frank O'Donnell - Valuer

Member

JUDGMENT OF THE VALUATION TRIBUNAL ISSUED ON THE 26TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2002

By Notice of Appeal dated the 26th April 2001 the appellant appealed against the determination of the Commissioner of Valuation in fixing a rateable valuation of €266.65 (£210) on the above described hereditament.

The grounds of appeal as set out in the said Notice of Appeal are that the valuation is excessive inequitable and bad in law.

This appeal proceeded by way of an oral hearing, which took place in Kilkenny on the 19th of October 2001. Mr Eamonn Halpin B.Sc.(Surveying) ASCS. ARICS MIAVI appeared on behalf of the Appellant. The Respondent was represented by Mr Des Doyle B.Comm., a valuer in theValuation Office. Evidence was given on behalf of the appellant by Mr. Eugene O'Donovan, Accountant. Both Valuers adopted as their evidence in chief, their written submissions, which had been received previously by the Tribunal and exchanged between them. From the evidence so tendered the following relevant facts either agreed or so found emerged as being material to this appeal.

The Property

The Property comprises a ten-bedroom hotel with two self-catering apartments adjoining the hotel. The buildings are located in a rural area in the tiny village of Knocktopher. It is about 13 miles from Kilkenny, six miles from Thomastown and about 17 miles from Waterford.

Appellant's Estimate of NAV

Method 1

T.O. YR. ended 31 August 2	000 Estm. NAV (1988 Tone)		
Bar £198.640 Less 35.2% to index = £128,719 @ 9%	1988 levels per alcoholic drinks	=	£11,585
Food £138,507 Accommodation £5,610]] = £144,117 less 35.2% to 1988 levels		
	£93,388 @ 7%	=	£ 6,537
			£18,122

2

Total Nav

			@ 0.5%	=	£90.61
Add owners a	accommodation at £2,00	00pa @ 0.5%		=	£10
					£10,061
			= RV£100 (incl	uding	g domestic)
Method 2.					
Hotel Proper	1208.72m ²	= 13,010 sq.ft. @	£1.60sq.ft.	£20	9,816
Domestic] Self catering				
] Apartments 272m ²	$^{2} = 2928$ sq.ft.@ £1.6	0sq.ft.	£ 4	,684
] and owners				
] accommodation			£25	5,500
			@ $0.5 = f$		50
			say £127		

(including domestic £23)

Valuation Office Estimate of NAV

Rateable Valua	ation @ .5%			=	£210
			Say	=	£42,000
				=	£42,098
Apartments	272 sq.m.	@	£27	=	£ 7,344
Hotel	1287.2 sq.m.	@	£27	=	£34,754

Findings

- The accounts of the subject produced late in the day did not have the detail or duration to assist in any meaningful analysis of N.A.V.
- (2) Respondent's Comparison No. 2 (Rhu Glenn) is altogether in a superior class and not really comparable.
- (3) Respondent's Comparison No. 3 (Horse and Jockey) cannot be used as a comparison being in a different rating area.
- (4) Comparison No. 1 the Rising Sun, is probably the most comparable although only a licensed Guesthouse, in that it has a better function room and a better location.
- (5) The road maps and evidence shows that the subject is in a much inferior location than any comparison offered.
- (6) There should be a reduction on the N.A.V. values of the Rising Sun.
- (7) This reduction should be from $\pounds 27$ to $\pounds 23$ per sq. m.
- (8) N.A.V. should be calculated as follows: -

Hotel 1287 sq. m.	@	€29.20 (£23)	= €37,580.4	(£29,606)
Apartments 272 sq. m.	@	€29.20 (£23)	= €7,942.4	(£7,344)
		N.A.V.	€45,522.8	(£35,862)

Accordingly the Tribunal determines the Rateable Valuation of the subject hereditament to be €228.56 (£180.00) and makes no order as to costs or expenses.