

Appeal No. VA88/0/226

AN BINSE LUACHÁLA
VALUATION TRIBUNAL
AN tACHT LUACHÁLA, 1988
VALUATION ACT, 1988

Pauline Reilly

APPELLANT

and

Commissioner of Valuation

RESPONDENT

RE: Unit 3, Castleknock Village Centre, Castleknock, Co. Dublin

B E F O R E

Hugh J O'Flaherty

S.C. Chairman

Mary Devins

Solicitor

Brian O'Farrell

Valuer

JUDGMENT OF THE VALUATION TRIBUNAL
ISSUED ON THE 11TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1988

By notice of appeal dated the 25th August, 1988, the appellant appealed against the determination of the respondent fixing the rateable valuation of the above described hereditament at £44.00.

The valuation history of the premises is as follows:-

In 1987 the hereditament was listed by Dublin County Council for the Annual Revision of Valuation. The listing was as follows: "value new Shopping Centre and Commercial Developments". Following revision no change was made as it appeared that the construction

work was not sufficiently well advanced when inspected by the revising valuer. Dublin County Council were aggrieved by this non-revision and appealed to the Commissioner of Valuation on the grounds that the development had been completed before the statutory date.

Mr Eamonn S. Halpin B.Sc. (Surveying) A.R.I.C.S., a valuer with eight years experience in the Valuation Office, was deputed to inspect the premises and report. Following upon Mr. Halpin's report on the premises the subject of this appeal and seven other units in the Centre were valued. The hereditament consists of a ground floor retail unit with ancillary shared carparking. A pharmaceutical business is carried on therein. It is situated in the new Castleknock Village Centre. This development, ten units in all, is in a prominent location in the heart of Castleknock with about 140 feet frontage to the main Castleknock Road.

The units are built with fair faced concrete block walls and have an insulated metal decking roof. The front of each unit is finished in brick and there is tiled canopy outside.

The standard units were sold by the Developers as bear shells, i.e. no internal finishes, windows etc. Purchase prices of £80,000 to £85,000 were paid.

Mrs Reilly, written submission, dated the 25th August, 1988, said that she had discovered that by comparison with similar sized units in other neighbouring shopping centres, namely Castlecourt she thought the rateable valuation of her premises was excessive.

She also made the point that in relation to the income generated by a pharmacy which was situated in a quite shopping centre meant that people would have to stop in a second shopping centre after having done their usual main supermarket shopping in one of the two big centres, namely, Blanchardstown Roselawn Shopping Centres.

Mr. Halpin made a written submission dated 11th October, 1988 and in the course of that submission he estimated the net annual value of the property to be £12,000 and he said the rateable valuation devalues as follows:-

Shop preparation area and w.c. 56.7 m sq @ 75p =	£42.52
Parking	<u>1.50</u>
	£44.02
	Say £44.00

Mr Halpin set out certain comparisons and, in particular, there was an identical property described as unit 5 which has the same rateable valuation.

At the oral hearing held on the 17th October, 1988, Mrs Reilly and Mr Halpin elaborated on their submissions.

In the result, Mr Halpin conceded that Roselawn and Blanchardstown might be more attractive centres and that if one had a choice then one might opt for either Roselawn or Blanchardstown as having better prospects. But, nonetheless, it seems that the same rent per sq ft, namely £20 per sq ft prevail in all three areas. This may seem paradoxical but it is the fact.

Mrs Reilly is in the situation that she paid a steep price for this unit; had to spend money on fitting it out and now is faced with a substantial rate bill.

While the Tribunal has every sympathy with her situation, nonetheless, having regard to the statutory requirement to have regard to like premises it seems that the letting value of units such as this is now well crystallised.

In all the circumstances, the Tribunal cannot find that there is any case to interfere with the determination of the Commissioner and, accordingly, his determination will be affirmed.