## EXHIBIT LIST

Reference No: HOL/00575
Petitioner: North Warwickshire Borough Council
Published to Collaboration Area: Thursday 07-Jul-2016

Page 1 of 110

| No | Exhibit Name | Page |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | P1748 NWBC 01 GIS Map.pdf (P1748) | 2 |
| 2 | P1749 NWBC_02_GIS Cotta.pdf (P1749) | 3 |
| 3 | P1750 NWBC 03 GIS OSalt.pdf (P1750) | 4 |
| 4 | P1751 NWBC 04 BRCompen.pdf (P1751) | 5 |
| 5 | P1752 NWBC 05 BR_Nb SC.pdf (P1752) | $6-8$ |
| 6 | P1753 NWBC 06 BR Findings.pdf (P1753) | $9-13$ |
| 7 | P1754 NWBC_07_BR_Rep Impl.pdf (P1754) | $14-42$ |
| 8 | P1755 NWBC 08 BR Addend Rep.pdf (P1755) | $43-50$ |
| 9 | P1756 NWBC 09 BR Rep.pdf (P1756) | $51-88$ |
| 10 | P1757 NWBC 10 BR Faraday PP.pdf (P1757) | $89-92$ |
| 11 | P1758 NWBC_11 Assur 2014.pdf (P1758) | $93-96$ |
| 12 | P1759 NWBC_12_Assur 2015.pdf (P1759) | $103-104$ |
| 13 | P1760 NWBC_13_Assur 2016.pdf (P1760) | $105-110$ |
| 14 | P1761 NWBC 14 Final HL PAL.pdf (P1761) |  |




Compensation for Business Rate Losses
The Promoter does not propose to provide any compensation to Local
Authorities for losses in business rates which are asserted to be in connection
with the construction or operation of Phase One of $\mathrm{HS}_{2}$, either as a result of
reductions in rateable values, the relocation of businesses outside of a Local
Authority's area or the demolition of commercial premises.

[^0]
## Note to Select Committee on the impact of the Construction of HS2 on business rates revenue - February 2016

1. On 27 October 2014, the Committee heard from North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC) with regard to the potential impact of HS2 on their (and other local authorities') business rates income and the study conducted by Wilks Head \& Eve on their behalf. The Committee requested on 28 October that DfT and HS2 Ltd look further into this issue. This note outlines the work that has been undertaken to explore this issue, and our concluding position.

## Expected losses and gains

2. The Promoter has been worked closely with the Department of Communities and Local Government in order to explore the likely impacts of HS2 on local authority business rates income, using NWBC as a case study and as a local authority that will be potentially affected by both business rates losses and gains. Montagu Evans property consultants and rating specialists were appointed by HS2 Ltd to review the findings of the Wilks Head \& Eve report. Montagu Evans produced an initial report giving their views on the potential impact of HS2 on the rateable value of NWBC's business properties and rates income. Following their initial report Montague Evans also provided an addendum report to provide an indication of the likely impacts on rateable values on an annual basis. The Montagu Evans report and addendum report has been shared with representatives from NWBC, Chiltern District Council and the London Borough of Camden.
3. Any assessment of the likely impact on rateable values should be treated with caution as until appeals are made the assessment of the rateable value impacts are subjective. The Montagu Evans report considered that the Wilks Head and Eve estimate of the impact of HS2 on rateable value (RV) losses in NWBC of $£ 9$ million to be overestimated. It instead found lower figures of between $£ 1.8$ million and $£ 5.3$ million. Although the actual rateable value impact cannot be predetermined, it is agreed there will be a loss of rateable value.
4. To understand the revenue impacts, Montague Evans produced an assessment of the annual impacts which showed a potential annual temporary loss between approx. £1m - $£ 4 \mathrm{~m}$ that would last a number of years, with a potential permanent loss of approx. £600k of rateable value from 2028/29 onward.
5. The assumptions took into account at the time of the report where it was known that certain businesses would be subject to demolition without relocation, and others that were expected to relocate within the Borough.
6. The actual losses will depend on the extent of mitigation measures implemented to limit disruption to businesses, particularly around Hams Hill Distribution Park and Coleshill Industrial Estate. Businesses required to relocate will be compensated through the Statutory Compensation Code and provided with practical assistance for relocation through an agency service.

Impact of HS2 development on income for NWDC
7. Any rateable value loss also needs to be converted into a loss of income. The 2019/20 loss compared to NWBC's current retained business rates could be between approx. $£ 240$ k and $£ 860 \mathrm{~K}$. Such a loss in business rates income is above NWBC baseline funding level and does not impact on DCLG's assessment of NWBC Core Spending Power ${ }^{1}$ of $£ 7$ m in 2019/20 or trigger a safety net payment.
8. It is not possible to predict the impact on NWBC income post 2020/21 until decisions are made over exactly how the $100 \%$ retained business rates proposal and the reset of the business rates retention system will be implemented.

## Potential gains on income for NWDC from HS2 development

9. There are also a number of potential gains for NWBC in business rates income and wider economic growth as a result of HS2, although these are difficult to quantify and are not assessed in the income losses. Facilities provided elsewhere for relocated businesses may attract higher values. NWBC will also receive temporary increases in RV as a result of construction compounds. These are estimated to add in the region of $£ 500,000$ in rateable value for NWBC, which based upon the current system could equate to $£ 100,000$ in retained business rates. With Birmingham Interchange HS2 Station half a mile outside of NWBC's administrative area, it is likely that there will also be an increase in job opportunities and economic growth in the region.
10. In 2013/14, NWBC experienced alterations in business rates of a net $£ 1.4 \mathrm{~m}$ RV. Therefore, potential movement as a result of HS2 may be no greater than churn already experienced by NWBC, although clearly may increase churn overall. On the other hand, the maximum scenario above could see more substantial losses for NWBC.
11. As a rural borough council without a HS2 station inside its administrative area, these figures indicate the expected impact on one of the worst affected local authorities. Other authorities, such as Birmingham and Camden, are expected to see business rates increases as a result of HS2. Thus, the overall impact of HS2 on local authority business rates income is more balanced.

## HS2's position on compensation

12. DfT, HS2 Ltd and DCLG have considered these figures and their potential implications for NWBC's income. The current Business Rates Retention Scheme is based on the principle that local authorities bear the risk of business rates decline and secure the rewards of growth. In line with that principle some local authorities are expected to see an increase in business rates from growth as a result of HS2. To provide a level of protection the system already has a safety net in place to guard against significant declines in local authority income. If a local authority's business rates income falls below $92.5 \%$ of the baseline funding level (the amount of an individual local authority's StartUp Funding Assessment for 2013-14 at the start of current rates retention system), the system will automatically compensate up to that safety net level.
13. If HS2 causes a drop in business rates income below the $92.5 \%$ level, the retention scheme would automatically adjust to compensate. This 'safety net' will only apply if the anticipated fall in business rates income takes a local authority below their 13/14

[^1]funding baseline - it could reduce the growth they have experienced since then. In NWBC case they are still estimated to receive additional funding than their baseline, but not as much as they might have done without HS2 from 2018/19 to 2019/20.
14. By the end of this Parliament the Government has also announced that the local government sector will retain 100\% of local taxes to spend on local government services. Over the coming months the Government will be consulting widely and openly in order to design a system that provides local authorities with the funding they need to deliver local services, and which provides the tools for councils to help grow their local economies.
15. The local authorities also queried whether business rates losses could be compensated through the New Burdens doctrine. DCLG have confirmed, however, that the New Burdens doctrine does not apply to changes in business rates income, except insofar as the Government makes changes to the tax regime which would reduce the amount of business rates that an authority could collect. Therefore, our assessment indicates that the New Burdens doctrine does not apply in this instance.
16. The Promoter recognises the above potential impacts on NWBC's business rates income and have discussed this in depth with DCLG, the actual impact on affected local authority incomes cannot be pre-determined. The rating consultants identified within NWBC a wide range of possible rateable value impacts, and given the need to consult widely on the form of the $100 \%$ Business Rates Retention Scheme in the future, there is uncertainty over the long term impact.
17. The Promoter's position is that it is therefore too early to come to a definitive position over whether HS2 funds should be used to provide a contribution towards mitigating losses in local authority revenues.
18. The Promoter is, however, mindful of the potential impacts on the business rates income of certain local authorities and commits to reviewing the situation from the start of 2018/19, which is at the end of the first year when the rating consultants identified a possible impact. This will allow us to assess what the revenue impacts actually are on local authority incomes before coming to a definitive position on how we respond to any revenue losses.
19. Our future consideration would need to take into account:

- That we do not wish to undermine the principle of current business rates retention scheme that authorities bear the risk of business rates decline and secure the reward of growth; and
- The precedent that could be created for future infrastructure projects.
20.DfT, HS2 Ltd, DCLG and Montagu Evans have met with representatives from local authorities (NWBC, Chiltern District Council, the London Borough of Camden and Wilks Head \& Eve) on two occasions in March and July 2015 to discuss the findings from the Montagu Evans report, the likely implications of the business rates income reductions on NWBC's services and facilities, and to feed into the development of our position.
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## 1. CONTEXT

Montagu Evans LLP was approached by Steven Kidd of HS2 on $4^{\text {th }}$ November 2014 to provide advice in respect of the potential Business Rates implications of the HS2 scheme with regards North Warwickshire Borough Council.

This followed production of a report commissioned by North Warwickshire Borough Council and written by Wilks Head and Eve, dated October 2014. The report, entitled "Report to NWBC for the Estimation of the Effect on Business Rate Income due to the Construction and Operation of HS2", sought to identify and quantify the potential effects on Business Rates revenue within the Borough. In particular, the report sought to assess the likely direct impact on the local economy of the Borough and in turn on the finances of the Borough both in the short and long term.

This summary of the main report has been produced by Mark Higgin BSc (Hons) FRICS FIRRV, an Equity Partner of the firm and Head of Business Rates, and Josh Myerson MSc MRICS IRRV (Hons), an Associate Partner in the Rating Department.

## 2. Review of Wilks Head \& Eve Report

The report identifies a number of ways in which the construction of HS2 might impact on rateable value, as follows:

1. Total Loss as a result of demolition
2. Blight prior to construction
3. Temporary losses during construction
4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability

A total Rateable Value of $£ 9,037,031$ has been identified as being "at risk". This RV is divided between the four scenarios in the following manner:

| 1. Total Loss as a result of demolition | $£ 3,136,600$ | $34.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Blight prior to construction | $£ 725,577$ |
| 3. Temporary losses during construction | $£ 4,670,287$ | $5.0 \%$ |
| 4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability | $£ 504,567$ | $5.6 \%$ |
|  |  | $£ 9,037,037$ |
|  |  | $100.0 \%$ |

In approaching our examination of the report, we have reviewed the rationale adopted in each of these categories of disturbance and undertaken an interrogation of both the data relied on by Wilks Head and Eve and conclusions drawn in terms of potential effect on Rateable Value.

We find it difficult to conclude that the foreseeable loss to RV within NWBC's boundary as a result of HS2 will be anywhere in the order of the figures set out above.

In particular, we understand that much of the RV identified as being lost through demolition will in reality not be lost. The report identifies $£ 3,136,600$ of rateable value attributable to some 66 hereditaments which will be lost through demolition. We have reviewed these hereditaments in detail and are unable to reach the same conclusions in terms of quantum to lost rateable value. To quantify the anticipated loss, we would suggest of the 66 hereditaments identified by the report:
Status
To be demolished
Not to be demolished
Part demolition
Part demolition
Demolition but relocation
Result
RV loss $100 \%$
No RV loss
No net RV loss
Potential RV Loss
No net RV loss

| Properties |  | RV |
| :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 13 | $£$ | 79,435 |
| 29 | $£$ | 641,100 |
| 5 | $£$ | $1,918,000$ |
| 4 | $£$ | 28,500 |
| 15 | $£$ | 469,565 |

We do not believe that ratepayers will be successful in arguing for a blight allowance in anticipation of the works, except in the most exceptional of circumstances. The merits of such an allowance are difficult to prove and the material day regulations will constrain the Valuation Officer in conceding allowances.

Properties will undoubtedly be affected negatively during the course of the works. However, we do not find that the level of RV loss will be as high as that cited in the report. We would further advise that it is likely that much of the possible loss could be mitigated by implementation of measures to limit disruption to business, especially in respect of Hams Hill Distribution Park and Coleshill Industrial Estate where much of the concern emanates from access issues.

There may be examples of properties that will see a permanent loss in value once HS2 becomes operational. However, as with blight prior to construction, these will have to be well evidenced and will likely only apply to exceptional circumstances. We have nonetheless, for the purpose of this report, maintained WH\&E figures.

Based on the foregoing, we quantify the potential at risk RV as being:

| 1. | Total Loss as a result of demolition | $£ 107,935$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. Blight prior to construction | $£ 0$ | $2.04 \%$ |
| 3. Temporary losses during construction | $£ 4,670,287$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| 4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability | $£ 504,567$ | $9.6 \%$ |
|  |  | $£ 5,282,789$ |

Should efforts to mitigate access concerns in respect of Hams Hill Distribution Park and Coleshill Industrial Estate so that no allowance could be justified, the potential at risk RV would reduce to:

| 1. | Total Loss as a result of demolition | $£ 107,935$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. Blight prior to construction | $£ 0$ | $6.0 \%$ |
| 3. Temporary losses during construction | $£ 1,195,089$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| 4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability | $£ 504,567$ | $27.9 \%$ |
|  | $£ 1,807,591$ | $100.0 \%$ |

## 3. ANALYSIS OF NWBC ACCOUNTS AND ASSESSMENT OF SENSITIVITY TO CHANGES IN RATE REVENUE.

As detailed, WH\&E identify $£ 9,037,037$ of "at risk" rateable value. They go on to adopt an assumed multiplier of 50 p to arrive at a "predicted loss" of $£ 4,517,539$.

It is incorrect to infer that a $£ 1$ loss in rateable value would result in a 50 p loss in revenue to NWBC, as the WH\&E report appears to do. Any potential loss would be divided via the local and central share polices at the heart of the business rates retention model. Moreover, any exposure to lost revenue would be further mitigated by NWBC's membership of the Coventry and Warwickshire Business Rate Pool as described earlier. Nevertheless, for the purpose of this exercise we adopt the same methodology.

Based on the foregoing, Montagu Evans believe $£ 5,282,789$ of RV to be at risk. If we broadly assume that a $£ 1$ loss in RV, would result in a 50 p total loss in possible revenue the "at risk" RV identified would give a potential revenue loss of in the order of $£ 2,641,394.40$.

Should efforts to mitigate access concerns in respect of Hams Hill Distribution Park and Coleshill Industrial Estate so that no allowance could be justified, the potential at risk RV would reduce to£1,807,591, which corresponds to a loss in monetary terms of $£ 903,795.50$.

The total loss of revenue does not represent the total loss of revenue to NWBC. In the first instance, the loss is shared with central government via the 50/50 rates retention mechanism. Moreover, NWBC will share some loss with Warwickshire County Council who bear a 10\% burden (and benefit from $10 \%$ of the rate increase). Finally, NWBC's membership of the Coventry and Warwickshire Business Rate Pool further dilutes the impact by sharing the burden over 6 other Billing Authorities.

Figures in terms of actual loss to NWBC will be provided by DCLG.

## 4. EXpected scope for extra revenue from HS2 work sites, relocated premises, any

 increase in RVs due to proximity to scheme and Birmingham Interchange.The Wilks Head and Eve report concludes that:

During the construction of HS2 there may be some betterment but very small in terms of Rateable Value for example contractor's huts and temporary contractors' facilities. There could be possible betterment in the future due to enhanced trade brought about due to HS2, i.e trade enhanced by the construction workforce but at the time of producing this report the added value is unquantifiable in terms of Rateable Value.

We do not reach the same conclusions in terms of the possible extra rateable value that might be created as a consequence of HS2.

There are two possible routes to RV creation:

1. Temporary RV created pursuant to construction
2. Long term RV appreciation following construction

Although very difficult at this early stage to quantify with any degree of certainly, it is likely that the presence of construction compounds, should they fall to be rateable, will attract a material rateable value that will go some way to offset the predicted loses.

It is likely that HS2 will lead to RV generation, both in the short and long term. Whilst it is unlikely that this will extinguish the projected loss through appeal or deletion, some of the loss could be mitigated. However, it is difficult to quantify.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

Montagu Evans LLP were approached by Steven Kidd of HS2 on $4^{\text {th }}$ November 2014 to provide advice in respect of the potential Business Rates implications of the HS2 scheme with regards North Warwickshire Borough Council.

This followed production of a report commissioned by North Warwickshire Borough Council and written by Wilks Head and Eve, dated October 2014. The report, entitled "Report to NWBC for the Estimation of the Effect on Business Rate Income due to the Construction and Operation of HS2", sought to identify and quantify the potential effects on Business Rates revenue within the Borough. In particular, the report sought to assess the likely direct impact on the local economy of the Borough and in turn on the finances of the Borough both in the short and long term.

Montagu Evans have been asked to review the report and provide a critique of the conclusions drawn. As part of the brief, Montagu Evans will also provide a narrative to the statutory and legislative framework in which business rates, and the collection thereof, operate.

Montagu Evans is a firm of Chartered Surveyors established in 1921 and based in London's Mayfair, with further offices in Manchester, Glasgow and Edinburgh. We have one of the UK's largest dedicated Business Rates departments, providing valuation and liability advice to a range of landlords and occupiers from both the Private and the Public sector.

This report has been produced by Mark Higgin BSc (Hons) FRICS FIRRV, an Equity Partner of the firm and Head of Business Rates, and Josh Myerson MSc MRICS IRRV (Hons), an Associate Partner in the Rating Department.

## 2. Main Review of Wilks Head \& Eve Report

. Detailed examination of the WH\&E report, including verification of the rateable value data utilised, likely levels of reduction, the extent to which works in relation to HS2 will impact on hereditaments and the associated value implication thereon.
$\cdot$ Details of the appeal process.

We have been provided with a copy of Wilks Head and Eve's report dated October 2014, together with relevant appendices. The report is entitled "Report to NWBC for the Estimation of the Effect on Business Rate Income due to the Construction and Operation of HS2" and seeks to assess the likely direct impact on the local economy of the Borough and in turn on the finances of the Borough both in the short and long term.

In so doing, the report identifies a number of ways in which the construction of HS2 might impact on rateable value (and thereby an implied direct and proportional effect on NWBC revenue). Four such scenarios are envisaged by the report, as follows:

1. Total Loss as a result of demolition
2. Blight prior to construction
3. Temporary losses during construction
4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability

A total Rateable Value of $£ 9,037,031$ has been identified as being at risk. This RV is divided between the four scenarios in the following manner:

| 1. | Total Loss as a result of demolition | $£ 3,136,600$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Blight prior to construction | $£ 725,577$ |
| 3. Temporary losses during construction | $£ 4,670,287$ | $5.0 \%$ |
| 4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability | $£ 504,567$ | $5.6 \%$ |
|  |  | $£ 9,037,037$ |
|  |  | $100.0 \%$ |

In approaching our examination of the report, we have reviewed the rationale adopted in each of these categories of disturbance and undertaken an interrogation of both the data relied on by Wilks Head and Eve and conclusions drawn in terms of potential effect on Rateable Value.

We then review the relationship between Rateable Value and Billing Authority revenue, albeit this is covered in more detail in a subsequent section.

To provide some legislative context, Rateable Value is in broad terms intended to reflect the open market rental value of a defined hereditament at a particular valuation date. Rateable Value is defined by Schedule 6 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 as follows:

1) The rateable value of a non-domestic hereditament none of which consists of domestic property and none of which is exempt from local non domestic rating] shall be taken to be an amount equal to the rent at which it is estimated the hereditament might reasonably be expected to let from year to year on these three assumptions-
(a) the first assumption is that the tenancy begins on the day by reference to which the determination is to be made;
(b) the second assumption is that immediately before the tenancy begins the hereditament is in a state of reasonable repair, but excluding from this assumption any repairs which a reasonable landlord would consider uneconomic;
(c) the third assumption is that the tenant undertakes to pay all usual tenant's rates and taxes and to bear the cost of the repairs and insurance and the other

In arriving at an assessment of rateable value, the act prescribes a dual date perspective, insofar as there is a valuation date and material date. For the purposes of the current Revaluation (being known as the 2010 List and with a currency of $1^{\text {st }}$ April 2010 to $31^{\text {st }}$ March 2017) that valuation date is $1^{\text {st }}$ April 2008. Physical matters adopted within that valuation exercise are taken at the Material Date, which for the purposes compiled list appeals is $1^{\text {st }}$ April 2010.

Where certain physical circumstances change during the currency of a rating list, legislation allows for these to be reflected in the assessment. Such circumstances fall to be considered material changes of circumstance which are to be considered at the relevant material date. They are defined in Schedule 6 of the LGFA 1988 as follows:
(6) Where the rateable value is determined with a view to making an alteration to a list which has been compiled (whether or not it is still in force) the matters mentioned in sub-paragraph (7) below shall be taken to be as they are assumed to be on the material day.
(6A) For the purposes of sub-paragraph (6) above the material day shall be such day as is determined in accordance with rules prescribed by regulations made by the Secretary of State.
(7) The matters are-
(a) matters affecting the physical state or physical enjoyment of the hereditament,
(b) the mode or category of occupation of the hereditament,
(c) the quantity of minerals or other substances in or extracted from the hereditament,
(cc) the quantity of refuse or waste material which is brought onto and permanently deposited on the hereditament
(d) matters affecting the physical state of the locality in which the hereditament is situated or which, though not affecting the physical state of the locality, are nonetheless physically manifest there, and
(e) the use or occupation of other premises situated in the locality of the hereditament.

Subsections 7 (a) and (d) provides avenues by which the construction of HS2 may lead to a valuesignificant material change of circumstance to hereditaments in the vicinity of the development, either where the construction directly affects the physical enjoyment of the hereditament (and where such physical enjoyment is detrimentally effected, so would the value potentially reduce) or where the construction affects the physical state of the locality in which the hereditament is situated or which, though not affecting the physical state of the locality, are nonetheless physically manifest there. This would cover a situation where, although the construction itself may be distant from the hereditament in question, the effects of that construction can nonetheless be shown to be physically manifest.

Wilks Head and Eve's report contends that the construction of HS2 will result in value-significant material changes of circumstances to some hereditaments located within North Warwickshire Borough Council and that such MCCs will have the result of reducing Rateable Values. It seeks to quantify such reductions in Rateable Value terms.

## 1. Total Loss as a result of demolition

In order to enable the construction of HS2, it will be necessary to demolish a number of NNDR hereditaments. Such demolition will result in the deletion of those hereditaments from list, leading to a total extinguish of the associated rateable value.

The report identifies $£ 3,136,600$ of rateable value attributable to some 66 hereditaments.

The report has assumed that all of the 66 identified hereditaments will be demolished, resulting in a full extinguishment of the associated Rateable Value. Wilks Head \& Eve note that they have "assumed that all of these properties will be demolished as it is unclear which ones will be kept and which ones will note" at the time of writing their report.

We have reviewed the 66 identified hereditaments in details and are unable to reach the same conclusions in terms of quantum to lost rateable value.

We identify 13 hereditaments that, at the time of writing, are likely to be subject to demolition and that will not be subject to relocation. These assessments amount to $£ 79,435$ of RV.

A further 15 hereditaments with a total RV of $£ 469,565$ are identified, at the time of writing, as being likely to be subject to demolition but which are likely to also be subject to relocation within the Borough. We consider it inappropriate to suggest that this rateable value will be lost in the long term. Indeed, facilities provided elsewhere may attract higher values on the basis that they will be newer (albeit it is conceded that, at this stage, such propositions are difficult to quantify).

Nine hereditaments will be subject to part demolition. These account for $£ 1,946,500$ of the identified RV. Of these, we have been able to review detail the intentions in respect of $£ 1,918,000$ of RV and conclude that there will be no long term loss.

We have been advised that the remaining 29 hereditaments identified in the WH\&E report will not be subject to demolition, albeit it may be considered appropriate for them to benefit from short term disturbance allowances. The current RV of these hereditaments totals $£ 641,100$.

A significant proportion of the rateable value attributed to the 66 hereditaments ( $£ 2,353,333$ / $75.03 \%$ ) relates to six hereditaments with live assessments in excess of $£ 100,000$ RV. The future of these six sites will therefore significantly affect the ultimate loss of rateable value through demolition and we consider it appropriate to review these six in greater detail, as follows:

IM House, South Drive Coleshill - RV £435,000
IM House is a large office building extending to some $3,226 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ (NIA) and located adjacent to the Colehill Manor Office Campus, which is nestled between the M6 and the M42. The report prepared on behalf of NWBC cites a full demolition and total RV loss.

We understand that the building in its current form will be demolished as part of the HS2 project. However, we further understand that IM Group hold a planning permission which would potentially allow for reconfiguration for the site through development. There is a strong possibility of RV creation, either through IM seeking to reconfigure the site for their own purposes or to unlock revenue through development for third parties, should they seek to relocate their business elsewhere (beyond the Borough boundary).
NWBC will undoubtedly want to ensure vitality of the area and would hopefully work together with developers to maximise opportunities which, as a direct albeit unrelated consequence, would lead to RV creation to mitigate (either in part or whole) the loss of RV. Conclusion: RV of current hereditament will be lost but high possibility of creation of RV to mitigate loss through reconfiguration and redevelopment of the site.
ii. The Garden \& Leisure Group Ltd, Melbick Nurseries, Chester Road, Coleshill- RV £420,000

The Garden \& Leisure Group Ltd occupy a 12,662 sq m garden centre located on the A446 close to Junction 7 of the M42. The report prepared on behalf of NWBC cites a full demolition and total RV loss.
We understand that the building will not be demolished. Instead, only part of the car park is required to facilitate the scheme. Car parking facilities lost to construction would be replaced via reconfiguration and such reconfiguration would be carried out is such a way to ensure that new spaces are provided in advance of other spaces being removed. Car parking is, in any event, implicitly reflected in the hereditament's valuation. The proximity of construction to the property may warrant a disturbance allowance.
Conclusion: RV of the current hereditament would not be lost. There may be some RV loss as a result of a successful appeal for disturbance but such a loss would be marginal.

## iii. Severn Trent Water, Sewage Works, Lichfield Road Coleshill - RV $£ 310,000$

iv. Severn Trent Water, Sludge Destruction, Lichfield Road Curdworth - RV $£ \mathbf{3 1 0 , 0 0 0}$

These two hereditaments make up a large water treatment and sewage works to the east of the M42 in close proximity to the Coleshill Industrial Estate and the Hams Hall Distribution Park.

We have been advised that construction of HS2 would necessitate the reconfiguration of the site but that works will remain open. We conclude that reconfiguration would be unlikely to lead to a long term loss of rateable value on the basis that the site would need to continue to serve the same demographic.
Conclusion. No foreseeable long term loss of RV.
v. Aston Villa FC Training Ground, Bodymoor Heath Lane, Middleton, Tamworth - RV £375,000

The property comprises Aston Villa's Premiership training ground and youth academy, sandwiched between the M42 to the east and the Belfry Golf Club to the west.

We have been advised that construction of HS2 will not result in the demolition of the site and total RV loss. Instead, we understand that the scheme would necessitate the loss of some of the youth training pitches. The main buildings and the higher value Premiership training pitches would be unaffected. The lost pitches would be provided for elsewhere on site or via the purchase of adjoining land. The proximity of construction (and of the final route) may result in the application of an allowance to disturbance. However, HS2 are sympathetic to concerns and we have been assured by HS2 that they are working closely with the occupier to ensure optimal mitigation of disturbance.
Conclusion. No foreseeable long term loss of RV.
vi. International Automotive, Gorsey Lane, Coleshill - RV $£ 670,000$

This hereditament comprises a large industrial unit on the edge of the western edge of the Coleshill Industrial Estate, to the south of the Severn Trent Water referenced above.

The report cites a total loss of RV. However, we have been advised that construction only requires demolition of part of the building. Indeed the part of the building concerned comprises an extension of the property that was completed 2014, pursuant to a planning application granted by NWBC in April 2012. It would appear that this extension, amounting to some $6,675 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$, does not appear in the live assessment for the building. On that basis, we allow for no RV loss. A short term allowance for disturbance may be warranted. Conclusion: No foreseeable long term loss of RV.

## Conclusion

The report cites $£ 3,136,600$ of RV lost through demolition pursuant to the construction of HS2. We find that the true anticipated loss of RV is far less. Where demolition is required, it is likely that much of the RV will be replaced via relocation within the borough. Where this relocation results in the construction of an improved hereditament, it is likely that the resultant increase in RV would go some way to mitigate the loss where relocation is not envisaged.

To quantify the anticipated loss, we would suggest of the 66 hereditaments identified by the report:

| Status | Result | Properties |  | RV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| To be demolished | RV loss 100\% | 13 | $£$ | 79,435 |
| Not to be demolished | No RV loss | 29 | $£$ | 641,100 |
| Part demolition | No net RV loss | 5 | $£$ | $1,918,000$ |
| Part demolition | Potential RV Loss | 4 | $£$ | 28,500 |
| Demolition but relocation | No net RV loss | 15 | $£$ | 469,565 |

## 2. Blight Prior to Construction

WH\&E notes that "once the order for HS2 has been confirmed it is possible that occupiers may appeal their assessments before any construction works commence on the assumption that rental values (and therefore RV) have been blighted by the scheme", arguing that this is on the basis that "the Statutory definition of Rateable Value... states that 'the property might reasonably be expected to let from year to year' which could have an effect on value"

They identify properties with a total RV of $£ 16,422,286$ that may qualify for such blight allowances and that such allowances would result in a reduction in rateable value of some $£ 725,577$.

In order to constitute a material change of circumstance that can be correctly reflected in a property's rateable value, Schedule 6 states that such a change must either physically affect the locality or, though not itself physically affecting the locality, its consequences are nonetheless physically manifest there.

Although the construction will not have started, case law provides precedent for examples where hereditaments subject to a compulsory purchase order have been altered to reflect the existence of such an order, where such an order is confirmed during the currency of a List [Prodorite Ltd -v- Clark (VO), [1993] RA 197 (LT)]. However, where such an order exists as at the AVD in confirmed form (not merely draft) its existence ought already to be reflected in prevailing rental values of hereditaments subject to it. Only where the order is confirmed at a later date would there be an effect on value.

Discussion of lost RV through blight prior to construction is therefore complicated given the fact that we are using 2010 Rateable Values as an indicative measure of lost future lost value. Where a discount in value is considered appropriate due to the existence of the order, this ought to already be reflected and the re-basing of an Authority's pool would capture it. Given the timetable for construction is still some way from today, mounting a successful and evidenced case against the VOA to seek blight allowances would be difficult.

We would note that of the $£ 16,422,286$ of rateable value identified by WH\&E as being possible recipients of a blight allowance, $£ 10,563,500$ ( $64.3 \%$ ) is limited to the Hams Hall Distribution Park and the Coleshill Industrial Estate (known in the report as Industrial 2 hereditaments). These properties have been singled out within the WH\&E report on the basis that they have concluded, whilst relatively distant from the construction project itself, these locations are particularly sensitive to issues surrounding access, the consequences of which may be physically manifest in the location. They state that they believe that Hams Hall and Coleshill Industrial Estate will be most affected, albeit we would note that they have adopted lower allowances than the other industrial hereditaments. Industrial 2 properties have been award a $5 \%$ allowance across the board, resulting in an "at risk" RV of $£ 528,178$ ( $72.8 \%$ of the total $£ 725,577$ RV "at risk"). We would anticipate that HS2 would seek to work closely with occupiers to ensure the minimum access to the road network.

Notwithstanding the above, we do not reach the same conclusion in terms of loss in advance of construction.

## 3. Temporary losses during construction

Loss of Rateable Value through successful appeals that seek an allowance during the period of the construction works represents the principle threat to revenue ( $£ 4,670,287$ of the total "at risk" RV of £9,037,031 [51.7\%]).

The Wilks Head and Eve report identifies properties with a total rateable value of $£ 37,795,651$ which may have a cause to be awarded an allowance during the works. The adoption of the allowances suggested in the report would result in a reduction of $£ 4,670,287$ of rateable value (an average reduction of $12.36 \%$ over the hereditaments identified).

In arriving at the potentially allowances to be adopted, WH\&E make the following comment:

We then looked in detail at each Valuation Office description code and produced a table showing the 72 Description types that would be affected by HS2. We then analysed how many properties were in each description code and what the total Rateable value was per code - See Appendix 2.

We then grouped together the description codes in a logical order to arrive at six description categories: Offices, Retail, Industrial, Leisure, Non-Residential Institution and Miscellaneous.

On further refection we believed that in the Industrial Category Hams Hall and Coleshill Industrial Estate could be affected due to possible access problems if problems were encountered during the construction of HS2 and therefore a further Industrial 2 category has been created - See Appendix 3.

We then used our expertise and Valuation knowledge of the Rating system to arrive at a set of possible scale of reductions that we believe could be achieved on each class of property.

We have been provided with a detailed breakdown of the hereditaments identified and would summarise as follows:

| Total Hereditaments |  |  |  |  |  |  | 730 | $£$ | $46,666,495$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Of which: | Offices | 221 | $£$ | $4,254,025$ | $9.1 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Retail | 133 | $£$ | $2,191,450$ | $4.7 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Industrial (1) | 91 | $£$ | $3,240,425$ | $6.9 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Industrial (2) | 150 | $£$ | $29,603,950$ | $63.4 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Miscellaneous | 71 | $£$ | $3,401,120$ | $7.3 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Leisure | 43 | $£$ | $3,354,525$ | $7.2 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | D2 | 21 | $£$ | 621,000 | $1.3 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $£$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Of these hereditaments, they conclude that the following would be candidates for disturbance allowances which they go on to quantity:

| Description | Total RV | Scale | RV after Scale | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8.68\% } \\ & 2.47 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Offices | £ 3,244,700 | 12.50\% | £ 405,588 |  |
| Retail | £ 1,535,340 | 7.50\% | £ 115,150 |  |
| Industrial | £ 2,650,000 | 15.00\% | £ 397,500 | 8.51\% |
| Industrial 2 | £ 25,742,211 | 13.50\% | £ 3,475,198 | 74.41\% |
| Leisure | £ 3,045,400 | 6.50\% | £ 197,951 | 4.24\% |
| D2 | £ 256,550 | 5.00\% | £ 12,828 | 0.27\% |
| Miscellaneous | £ 1,321,450 | 5.00\% | £ 66,072 | 1.41\% |
|  | £ 37,795,651 |  | 670,287.00 | 100\% |

It should be noted that around 400 of the identified hereditaments currently qualify for some form small business rate relief. For the current rate year, properties with RVs of below $£ 6,000$ receive $100 \%$ of relief. Properties with RVs of between $£ 6,000$ and $£ 11,999$ received between $100 \%$ and $0 \%$ relief on a sliding scale. We arrive at a total RV of circa $£ 800,000$ in respect of properties that we believe qualify for $100 \%$. A further c .150 properties with an aggregate RV of $£ 1.25 \mathrm{~m}$ may qualify for relief on a sliding scale. Adopting an average of $50 \%$ relief would reduce the identified RV by around $£ 625,000$, to give a total RV of $£ 1.425$ m to be removed from the above table. However, at on $3.77 \%$ of the total RV identified, allowing for a margin of error, we adopt WH\&E's figures as a starting point.

Unlike the loss of rateable value following a deletion, which is absolute, reductions in assessment following a material change of circumstance are evidence based. As set out earlier, rateable value is intended to broadly reflect rental value of a property, or part of a property. At the commencement of a rating list, the valuation is taken assuming rental values at the antecedent valuation date with physical circumstances as they stand at the start of that List (i.e. $1^{\text {st }}$ April 2008 and $1^{\text {st }}$ April 2010 for the 2010 Rating List). Where a material change of circumstance occurs after the compilation of the rating list, where that change can be taken into account under Schedule 6 of the LGFA 1988, the assessment can be altered to reflect that change. Such an alteration can result in a decrease or increase in value.

For material changes that turn on a perceived detrimental effect on a property's rental value as a result of disturbance emanating from an external source, market practice is for that property's assessment to include an end allowance (say $5 \%$ or $10 \%$ ). This allowance is intended reflect the reduction in rental value. However, it is rare for such an allowance to be based on actual reductions evidenced in the rental market on the basis that rent reductions are rarely granted. Instead, evidence for the quantum of an allowance is derived from settlements of comparable assessments.

WH\&E adopt a similar rationale in their report, cited that they have "used our expertise and Valuation knowledge of the Rating system to arrive at a set of possible scale of reductions that we believe could be achieved on each class of property".

We cannot find fault with this approach. However, we have concerns as to the level of allowances that have been suggested, which range from $5 \%$ to $15 \%$.

In particular, we have concerns with the allowances suggested in respect of the offices, retail and industrial hereditaments (12.5\%, 7.5\%, 13.50-15\% respectively).

For example, it has been suggested that retail properties will benefit from an average allowance of $7.5 \%$. As a very rough rule of thumb, such an allowance would follow evidence that turnover had been negatively affected in the order of $15 \%$. Such a downturn must be linked to the material change cited and, where the originator of the MCC is distant from the appeal property, the effects of the change must be physically manifest in the locality. These properties are predominantly located in Coleshill (High Street, Coventry Road, Parkfield Road), Middleton (Middleton Hall) and Water Orton (Birmingham Road). These locations are quite distant from the construction works themselves and so there must be the assumption that physically manifest disruption will follow in the town centre as a consequence of the nearby works. On the basis of an indirect nature of the disruption, we would suggest that the average $7.5 \%$ put forward appears optimistic. Implementation of measures to lessen disruption would have a material effect on the justification for allowances of this order.

However, the allowances proffered on the offices, retail and industrial 1 properties account for only 20\% of "at risk" RV. 74.4\% of the "at risk" RV relates to industrial 2 hereditaments, being properties located on the Hams Hill Distribution Park and the Coleshill Industrial Estate. Whilst relatively small in number (150), the hereditaments in these two locations represent some of the largest properties that might be affected by HS2 (a few of which have RVs of several million pounds). Although relatively distant from the path of the line, it is claimed that the disturbance would materialise in the form of impinged access. WH\&E suggest an average allowance across these hereditaments of $13.50 \%$. We regard this to be a significant allowance.

We further understand that HS2 are conscious of concerns raised by occupiers of these two estates surrounding issues of access. We understand that HS2 intend to put measures into place with a view to mitigating any disruptions to these properties in terms of access etc. Should these measures prove successful, the case for a reduction through disturbance would be severely weakened and may indeed be fully extinguished.

Similar measures in respect of the other identified hereditaments are likely to go some way to lessen the justification for allowances.

As an aside, WH\&E suggests that these allowances will be in place across all of the identified hereditaments for a period of 7-10 years. However, it is highly unlikely that all the hereditaments will be affected to the same degree for the duration of the project. Some areas will be more affected at one time and others.

## 4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability

The report identifies a number of properties that are particularly close to the path of the line and which therefore may suffer ongoing disturbance from the operation of the HS2 route. Such disturbance is described as amounting to noise, dust and general disturbance and the allowances are quantified as follows:

| Description | Total RV |  | Scale | RV after Scale |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Offices | $£ \quad 1,482,000$ | $3.50 \%$ | $£$ | 51,870 |  |
| Retail | $£ \quad 720,617$ | $5.00 \%$ | $£$ | 36,000 |  |
| Industrial | $£ 1,256,540$ | $15.00 \%$ | $£$ | 188,481 |  |
| Industrial 2 | $£ 1,045,678$ | $12.50 \%$ | $£$ | 130,710 |  |
| Leisure | $£ 2,496,500$ | $2.00 \%$ | $£$ | 49,900 |  |
| D2 | $£$ | 20,300 | $2.00 \%$ | $£$ | 406 |
| Miscellaneous | $£ 1,180,000$ | $4.00 \%$ | $£$ | 47,200 |  |

10.28\%
7.13\%
37.35\%
25.91\%
9.89\%
0.08\%
9.35\%

As with temporary allowances, any allowances that may be due on the basis of permanent disabilities will need to be evidence based. It may be that these properties will indeed continue to suffer from the operation of HS2 and that such suffering would have a material impact on the properties' rental values. However, it is equally possible that the properties would see some benefit from the implementation of HS2 (covered in more detail in a later section).

We would suggest that the proffered allowances seem generous, especially in respect of the industrial hereditaments which one might expect would less disturbed by external noise and dust give the mode and category of their own occupations.

## Conclusions

The Wilks Head and Eve report identifies the follow RV as being "at risk":

| 1. Total Loss as a result of demolition | $£ 3,136,600$ | $34.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. Blight prior to construction | $£ 725,577$ | $8.0 \%$ |
| 3. Temporary losses during construction | $£ 4,670,287$ | $51.7 \%$ |
| 4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability | $£ 504,567$ | $5.6 \%$ |
|  | $£ 9,037,037$ | $100.0 \%$ |

We find it difficult to conclude that the foreseeable loss to RV within NWBC's boundary as a result of HS2 will be anywhere in the order of the figures set out above.

In particular, we understand that much of the RV identified as being lost through demolition will in reality not be lost.

We do not believe that ratepayers will be successful in arguing for a blight allowance in anticipation of the works, except in the most exceptional of circumstances. The merits of such an allowance are difficult to prove and the material day regulations will constrain the Valuation Officer in conceding allowances.

Properties will undoubtedly be affected negatively during the course of the works. However, we do not find that the level of RV loss will be as high as that cited in the report. We would further advise that it is likely that much of the possible loss could be mitigated by implementation of measures to limit disruption to business, especially in respect of Hams Hill Distribution Park and Coleshill Industrial Estate where much of the concern emanates from access issues.

There may be examples of properties that will see a permanent loss in value once HS2 becomes operational. However, as with blight prior to construction, these will have to be well evidenced and will likely only apply to exceptional circumstances. We have nonetheless, for the purpose of this report, maintained WH\&E figures.

Based on the foregoing, we quantify the potential at risk RV as being:

1. Total Loss as a result of demolition
2. Blight prior to construction
3. Temporary losses during construction
4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability

| $£ 107,935$ | $2.04 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $£ 0$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $£ 4,670,287$ | $88.4 \%$ |
| $£ 504,567$ | $9.6 \%$ |
| $£ 5,282,789$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Should efforts to mitigate access concerns in respect of Hams Hill Distribution Park and Coleshill Industrial Estate so that no allowance could be justified, the potential at risk RV would reduce to:

1. Total Loss as a result of demolition
2. Blight prior to construction
3. Temporary losses during construction
4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability
£107,935 6.0\%
£0 0.0\%
£1,195,089 66.1\%
£504,567 27.9\%
£1,807,591 100.0\%
5. Summary of local government finance regime, part played by business rates, and the localism point. Statement about upcoming and future reviews to RVs INCLUDING COMMENT ON PHASING OF CHANGES ETC.

## Business Rates Retention

Until recently, Business Rates have represented a Treasury tax. Whilst the Billing Authorities were tasked with collecting the liability from ratepayers, this was on behalf of Central Government. Business rates were collected by the Billing Authorities, pooled centrally by the Government and then redistributed back to the Billing Authorities via a system of formula grant.

This process changed materially with effect from $1^{\text {st }}$ April 2013 with the introduction business rates retention via the Local Government Finance Act 2012, and subsequent regulatory amendments. Rate retention gave Billing Authorities the ability to retain half of the addition revenue created by Rateable Value creation, effectively splitting the additional income received by Billing Authorities into two discrete streams, known as the local share and the central share. Half of the increase would be retained and half would be passed onto Central Government and redistributed back to other Billing Authorities in the form of revenue support (similar to formula grant).

The intention of the policy was to incentivise Billing Authorities to promote development so that they might benefit from increased revenue. The Policy Statement notes:

The rates retention scheme will provide a strong incentive for local authorities to promote growth, while ensuring all local authorities have adequate resources to provide services to local people. It will give councils every possible reason to use the influence they have over planning, investment in skills and infrastructure and their relationship with local businesses to create the right conditions for local economic growth.

Economic analysis highlights that the incentive for growth introduced through these reforms could add approximately an additional $£ 10$ billion to the national economy over the next seven years

However, as a trade-off, Billing Authorities are also expected to absorb half of the potential loss in rate revenue via Rateable Value lost as a consequence of Rating List changes (appeals, material changes of circumstance etc.).

In very simplistic terms, this would mean that for every pound of liability lost would result in a decrease in Billing Authority revenue of 50p. With the UBR broadly 50p in the pound, this would translate to a 25 p loss of revenue for every pound of Rateable Value lost from the List. In reality, the actual calculations are more complicated as there is a system of tariffs and top ups, together with payments to major precepting authorities.

Whilst it was hoped that any loss in revenue through RV reduction would be offset by increases in revenue from RV creation, the Government sought to protect Billing Authorities from significant downwards fluctuations in revenue received and incorporated a number of measures to achieve this including:

1. Safety Net

The Government has incorporated a safety net procedure in an attempt to mitigate exposure to significant reductions in business rates income. This safety net is set at a threshold of $-7.5 \%$. Where actual revenue falls below $92.5 \%$ of the baseline funding level, Billing Authorities will receive a safety net payment to redress.
2. Volatility Measures

In addition to the safety net procedures, Government has introduced a further measure to limit exposure to volatile revenue returns, via a calibration adjustment that seeks to "allow for historic differences between local authority forecast estimates and final outturn figures (where the latter have tended to be lower than the former). As the adjustment will be made to the aggregate, the same percentage reduction will apply to all authorities. In the 2012/13 forecast of business rates (set by the Office for Budget Responsibility), the adjustment was 5\%". Moreover "the Government has decided to make a further downwards adjustment to the estimated business rates aggregate to reflect the aggregate cost to local authorities of losses incurred as a result of successful appeals against the rating list which are still outstanding."
3. Pooling

Pooling is a mechanism by which Billing Authorities can pool their business rates for the purposes of the retention/grant calculations. These allows for a number of smaller Authorities to band together, both sharing any positional increase in rate revenue through the rate retention scheme as well as sharing the burden of risk to revenue loss. The Policy Statement notes:
[Pooling gives Billing Authorities] scope potentially to generate additional growth through collaborative effort, and to smooth the impact of volatility in rates income across a wider economic area.

We would note that NWBC is a member of the Coventry and Warwickshire Business Rate Pool along with six other Local Authorities (Coventry City Council, Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council, Rugby Borough Council, Stratford-on-Avon District Council, Warwick District Council and Warwickshire County Council). Any potential loss to income would be shared among the pool members. Moreover, there is an opportunity to NWBC to benefit from additional income as a result of rateable value increases resulting from HS2's wider positive impact on the local area. We understand that the Local Pool agreed a safety net
provision at a $5 \%$ loss of baseline funding, which would benefit the Council in the event that business rates fall.

The foregoing is intended to provide a very simplistic outline of the policies and procedures surrounding business rate retention. It is important to note, however, that a $£ 1$ pound reduction in rate liability lost via appeal would not result in a $£ 1$ loss in revenue to the Billing Authority in which the appeal hereditament is located. The burden of risk is shared with central government and can be further mitigated through pooling. In the event of a catastrophic reduction in rate income, a safety net is in place to shield Billing Authorities from the true loss in revenue.

## Interaction of Business Rates Revaluation

As part of this section, we have also been asked to provide an explanation of the Revaluation process, particularly in relation to the forthcoming 2017 Revaluation and the likely impact on future values and revenues.

Section 2 of this report discusses the possible loss of rateable value as a direct consequence of the HS2 construction project. As with the Wilks Head \& Eve report, such discussion is couched in 2010 terms: i.e. what would the potential loss of rateable value be if the project were to commence tomorrow. In reality, the project is not due to commence for several years and as such any loss in rateable value will not be realised until that point.

The current revaluation period (which has resulted in the 2010 List) is due to come to an end on $31^{\text {st }}$ March 2017, with the compilation of the 2017 List on $1^{\text {st }}$ April 2017. At this point, all properties will be revalued having regard to rental values at the revised antecedent valuation date of $1^{\text {st }}$ April 2015 and assuming physical circumstances as at the material date of $1^{\text {st }}$ April 2017.

As such, any potential Rateable Value loss through HS2 will be in respect of the 2017 compiled values, which may be higher or lower than the current values. With material changes of circumstances as a result of disturbance generally being based on a percentage reduction in original value, the percentages of reduction illustrated in Section 2 provide an indicated of possible RV loss but do not directly translate into actual RV loss, and thereby actual loss of revenue to the Billing Authority. Should rateable values in NWBC fall following the 2017 revaluation, a $7.5 \%$ reduction in rateable value would not equate to such a loss as compared with 2010 values. This assumes a stable uniform business rate multiplier. Moreover, should the multiplier fall following the revaluation (due to an increase in the national aggregate rateable value and the need to maintain the take, save for inflation) then the loss in real terms would be further eroded.

However, this is conjecture. We are only able to provide an indicative illustration of HS2's potential impact.

## Supplementary forms of income collected under the business rates regime

We are asked to identify any other income collected under the wider business rates regime that might be affected by HS2.

The primary revenue stream would be that of Business Improvement District (BID) Levy. A BID levy is an additional charge over and above rating liability that are created in particular area with the aim of improving that area. BID are administered separately from Local Authorities via BID companies. BID levies can be calculated in a number of ways but generally seek to levy a charge in the order of $1 \%$ of rateable value on qualifying hereditaments. Often there are rateable value threshold to ensure that only business of a certain size fall liable (eg. 1\% of RV for hereditaments with RVs in excess of £50,000).

We are not aware of any BIDs currently operating in NWBC.

We would further note that often BID levy calculations do not take into account changes to RV as a result of material changes of circumstance. Instead, the calculation is often based on a percentage of the rateable value as it appeared in the List at a particular date. Therefore loss of RV would not necessarily have an effect on BID Levy take. Moreover, the revenue is ring fenced for spending and would not be included in the Billing Authority's revenue.

## 4. Analysis of NWBC accounts and assessment of sensitivity to changes in rate

 REVENUE.As per Section 2 of this report, WH\&E identify the following "at risk" rateable value:

| 1. | Total Loss as a result of demolition | $£ 3,136,600$ | $34.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Blight prior to construction | $£ 725,577$ | $8.0 \%$ |
| 3. Temporary losses during construction | $£ 4,670,287$ | $51.7 \%$ |  |
| 4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability | $£ 504,567$ | $5.6 \%$ |  |
|  |  | $£ 9,037,037$ | $100.0 \%$ |

They go on to adopt an assumed multiplier of 50p to arrive at a "predicted loss" as follows:

1. Total Loss as a result of demolition
2. Blight prior to construction
3. Temporary losses during construction
4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability
£1,568,300 34.7\%
£361,800 8.0\%
£2,335,144* 51.7\%
£252,295 5.6\%
£4,517,539 100.0\%
*this loss appears as $£ 2,184,383$ elsewhere in the report

In terms of the potential "at risk" RV, which we explore in detail in Section 2, we arrive at figures substantially less than those proffered above, especially in respect of total loss through demolition. We anticipate that much of the potential RV at risk as a result of temporary disturbance could be mitigated by proactive measures undertaken by HS2 to reduce impact. This is especially true in respect of the identified Industrial 2 hereditaments (Hams Hall Distribution Park and Coleshill Industrial Estate), which account for $74.41 \%$ of the identified at risk RV.

In the context of Section 3 of this report, it is incorrect to infer that a $£ 1$ loss in rateable value would result in a 50 p loss in revenue to NWBC, as the WH\&E report appears to do. Any potential loss would be divided via the local and central share polices at the heart of the business rates retention model. Moreover, any exposure to lost revenue would be further mitigated by NWBC's membership of the Coventry and Warwickshire Business Rate Pool as described earlier.

Nevertheless, we seek to place the anticipated loss into a wider context. For the purposes of this exercise, we adopt our analysis of the total RV at risk via demolition and blight but maintain the figures proffered by Wilks Head and Eve in respect of short and long term effects. This is on the basis that estimating potential allowances that might be adopted as a consequence of HS2 is a matter of valuer opinion. Whilst we do not necessarily agree with the quantum of allowances adopted by WH\&E in their report, it may be the case that disturbance is perceived to be so great by the VOA
that they elect to adopt allowances of this order. The analysis below therefore represents a "worst case scenario" and that we would anticipate that HS2 would seek to finds ways in which to most effectively mitigate any potential impact.

Based on the foregoing, the following RV at risk has been adopted:

| 1. Total Loss as a result of demolition | $£ 107,935$ | $2.04 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. Blight prior to construction | $£ 0$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| 3. Temporary losses during construction | $£ 4,670,287$ | $88.4 \%$ |
| 4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability | $£ 504,567$ | $9.6 \%$ |
|  | $£ 5,282,789$ | $100.0 \%$ |

If we broadly assume that a $£ 1$ loss in RV, would result in a 50 p total loss in possible revenue the "at risk" RV identified would give a potential revenue loss of in the order of $£ 2,641,394.40$

Should efforts to mitigate access concerns in respect of Hams Hill Distribution Park and Coleshill Industrial Estate so that no allowance could be justified, the potential at risk RV would reduce to:

| 1. | Total Loss as a result of demolition | $£ 107,935$ | $6.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Blight prior to construction | $£ 0$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| 3. Temporary losses during construction | $£ 1,195,089$ | $66.1 \%$ |  |
| 4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability | $£ 504,567$ | $27.9 \%$ |  |
|  |  | $£ 1,807,591$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Adopting the same assumption that a $£ 1$ loss in RV, would result in a 50 p total loss in possible revenue the "at risk" RV identified would give a potential revenue loss of in the order of $£ 903,795.50$

As at the date of this report, the Local Rating List contains some 2,250 hereditaments that fall within NWBC's boundary. These hereditaments had an aggregate RV of some $£ 98,441,048$. Adopting the $2014 / 15$ UBR and small business multiplier, this would result in a total take of $£ 47,336,214$ (before the application of exemptions and reliefs). In 2013/14, they collected a total of $£ 39,230,000$ against a possible take of $£ 46,273,794$, suggesting a $15.2 \%$ loss to reliefs and exemptions. Assuming a similar profile for $2014 / 15$ would give a net collection fund of $£ 40,130,699$. Based on the two scenarios set out above, total income may be effected by a factor of between $2.25 \%$ and $6.58 \%$, far less than the $11.5 \%$ inferred in the WH\&E report.

Of course, the total loss of revenue does not represent the total loss of revenue to NWBC. In the first instance, the loss is shared with central government via the 50/50 rates retention mechanism. Moreover, NWBC will share some loss with Warwickshire County Council who bear a $10 \%$ burden (and benefit from $10 \%$ of the rate increase). Finally, NWBC's membership of the Coventry and

Warwickshire Business Rate Pool further dilutes the impact by sharing the burden over 6 other Billing Authorities.

Whilst the calculation of actual income to Billing Authorities is very complex, given the tariff/top-up mechanism, we conclude that the actual impact to NWBC revenue will be far less than inferred by the WH\&E report.

It has been suggested that HS2 will create RV loss above and beyond that envisaged by the safety net provision included in the rate retention scheme. To place the total loss into context, we have reviewed List alterations that took place between $1^{\text {st }}$ April 2013 and $31^{\text {st }}$ March 2014.

There were 400 such list alterations in NWBC and would comment as follows:

- 48 were simple address changes.
- 81 were MCCs to reflect the opening of a Morrisons superstore resulting in circa $£ 42,900$ of RV loss (the assessment entered the List the previous year with an RV of $£ 229,000$ )
- 46 new hereditaments were created with a total RV gain of $£ 3,361,979$ (including $£ 2.96 \mathrm{~m}$ in respect of an Ocado Distribution Centre)
- 40 hereditaments were removed from the List with a total RV of $£ 541,105$
- The remaining 146 alterations were a mixture of reductions, increases and reconstitutions. The net RV change as a result was a loss of $£ 4,173,625$

| RV Loss: | $£ 4,757,630$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| RV Gain: | $£ 3,361,979$ |
| Net: | $(£ 1,395,651)$ RV Loss |

This would suggest that the potential RV losses outlined earlier are not significantly greater than what has previously been experienced. Moreover, should NWBC continue to see RV creation, either related or unrelated to the HS2 project, much of the potential impact could be mitigated.

## 5. EXPECTED SCOPE FOR EXTRA REVENUE FROM HS2 WORK SItES, RELOCATED PREMISES, any increase in RVs due to proximity to scheme and Birmingham Interchange.

The Wilks Head and Eve report concludes that:


#### Abstract

During the construction of HS2 there may be some betterment but very small in terms of Rateable Value for example contractor's huts and temporary contractors' facilities. There could be possible betterment in the future due to enhanced trade brought about due to HS2, i.e trade enhanced by the construction workforce but at the time of producing this report the added value is unquantifiable in terms of Rateable Value.


We do not reach the same conclusions in terms of the possible extra rateable value that might be created as a consequence of HS2.

There are two possible routes to RV creation:

1. Temporary RV created pursuant to construction
2. Long term RV appreciation following construction

## Temporary RV created pursuant to construction

To facilitate the construction, it will be necessary to create a network of satellite construction compounds along the route. So long as these compounds satisfy the primarily tenets of rateable occupation (occupation that is actual, beneficial, exclusive and not too transient) they may fall to be rateable and will be entered into the rating list for the duration of their existence.

We understand that 74 such compounds will be required within Warwickshire. Most of these compounds will remain in existence for a minimum of 12 months and some will be in existence for considerable longer (e.g. Main area administration and support compounds).

According to the HS2 Environmental Impact Statement, all main site compounds would contain space for the storage of bulk materials (aggregates, structural steel, steel reinforcement), an area for the fabrication of temporary works equipment and finished goods, fuel storage, plant and equipment storage and necessary operational parking. Buildings would be generally temporary modular units and layout would maximise construction space and limit land required. Hard standing areas would be installed at all site compounds. Primary main construction compounds would provide office and welfare accommodation.

Although varying in size, some of these compounds will clearly be significant and will attract a rateable value. Whilst we do not suggest that the creation of RV will extinguish RV loss through appeal and demolition, it is conceivable that some of the loss will be mitigated.

We have attempted to provide an indication of likely RV generation as a result of the assessment of the construction compounds.

We have undertaken a detailed review of the proposed route and of the 74 compounds that will be located in Warwickshire, we have identified 43 which will be located within the NWBC boundary. Of these, we conclude that 40 may fall to be rateable.

There is very limited information currently available with regards to what these compounds will comprise, aside from the generic narrative provided by the Environment Impact Statements, as quoted above. Therefore, we have roughly estimated the size of each of the compounds having regard to the construction phase map books published by HS2 and have then grouped the compounds into four categories (Small, Medium, Large, Very Large). To three of these four categories, we have applied RV spot figures based on an estimate of the likely layout and configuration of those compounds, having regard to comparable compounds associated with similar schemes.

For the small, medium and large compounds, we arrive at an estimated aggregate RV of $£ 250,000$

There is one very large compound, known as the Kingsbury Road Railhead. This is a significant facility that will act as the main construction compound on this section of the route and which will serve the various satellite compounds. As with the smaller compounds, we have very little information in terms of what this facility will comprise. However, having regard to the Construction Phase Map Books, we are aware that this will be a sizeable and semi-permanent facility likely to attract a notinsignificant rateable value. Having regard to what may be included on site and have regard to comparable facilities on similar scheme, an RV of $£ 250,000$ would not be unrealistic.

## Conclusion

Although very difficult at this early stage to quantify with any degree of certainly, it is likely that the presence of construction compounds, should they fall to be rateable, will attract a material rateable value that will go some way to offset the predicted loses.

## Long term RV appreciation following construction

HS2 represents a major infrastructure project which is intended to bring wide-ranging benefits to various parts of the country. Whilst there are no plans to position a new station within NWBC's boundary, the new Birmingham Interchange station is in very close proximity, being just over the border in Solihull. It is conceivable that such proximity to a major new interchange station would have an indirect benefit on rental values in neighbouring NWBC which might, either via revaluation or material change, result in increased rateable values.

However, such benefits will not be seen until after construction is complete and it is not possible to quantify such a benefit in real terms.

## Conclusion

It is likely that HS2 will lead to RV generation, both in the short and long term. Whilst it is unlikely that this will extinguish the projected loss through appeal or deletion, some of the loss could be mitigated. However, it is difficult to quantify.

## 6. InVEStigAtion into other options to mitigate loss of income aside from that

 ALREADY ENVISAGED BY THE CURRENT LEGISLATIONThe valuation of property for rating purposes is not concerned with politics. The statutory framework on which the valuation is based is relatively straightforward. A valuer seeks only to ascertain what rent a particular property, or part of a property, would be able to be let for at a particular date. Where it can be shown that a property's true rental value has been negatively effected by an event, and where such an event can correctly be taken into account in ascertaining the hypothetical rental value, then the assessment must be reduced.

Therefore, if it can be shown that properties' assessment should be reduced because of disturbance emanating from HS2, then the Valuation Officer must reduce those assessments and the Billing Authority must recalculate the ratepayer's liability based on the revised value.

Where a Billing Authority finds that its rate take is materially impeded, current legislation provides for a safety net to ensure that the BA does not have to carry the fully burden of that loss. Schemes such a pooling go further to mitigate the risk. These measures have been explored in an earlier sections

It has been suggested that the safety net and other associated measures do not go far enough to protect BAs from loss of income. However, we are unaware of any other procedures currently in place which could be used to mitigate the loss of income. We are further unware of any steps previously taken by Central Government to compensate Local Government for the loss of rate income based on major infrastructure projects (eg. HS1 and Crossrail), albeit we would note that these were prior to the implementation of rate retention.

Should it be considered appropriate to compensate Billing Authorities, we can see three ways in which it might be achieved.

1. Amendment to the safety net threshold

Changes to the safety net threshold. Perhaps specifically to protect smaller BAs whose budgets might be more effected by losses in revenue.
2. Ring-fencing and reimbursing loss

Identify loss suffered as a direct result of HS2 impact appeals and provide a mechanism for removing this loss from the rate retention calculation so that it falls fully in the central share.
3. Changes to top-up/tariff calculations

Alter the top-up/tariff calculation to create a net neutral provision for BAs affected by loss through HS2 impact appeals

In the event that BAs benefit from RV creation, either shorter through construction hereditaments being entered into the List or more long term rental appreciation, the possibility of claw back provisions could be investigated. However, such measures might prove very complicated to implement.
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## HS2 Addendum Report

This addendum report has been produced by Mark Higgin BSc (Hons) FRICS FIRRV, an Equity Partner of the firm and Head of Business Rates, and Josh Myerson MSC MRICS IRRV (Hons), a Partner in the Rating Department.

As part of our initial report, and in response to the original report prepared on behalf of North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC) by Wilks Head and Eve (WH\&E), we were asked to comment on the likely quantum of temporary allowances that may be conceded on hereditaments adversely affected by the construction of the HS2 line.

WH\&E arrived at the following figures (in rateable value terms):

1. Total Loss as a result of demolition
2. Blight prior to construction
3. Temporary losses during construction
4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability
$£ 3,136,600 \quad 34.7 \%$
£725,577 8.0\%
£4,670,287 51.7\%
£504,567 5.6\%
£9,037,037 100.0\%

In common with $W H \& E$, we identified those properties which might suffer disturbance sufficient to warrant a reduction in rateable value and adopted appropriate levels of allowance (principally maintaining the levels of allowances set out in the WH\&E report). The exercise was an attempt to provide an indication of the potential loss of rateable value (and therefore rate liability income).

In conclusion to our original report, we provided two scenarios. One amounted to our opinion of worst case position and a second which assumed there would be sufficient mitigation measures implemented by HS2 to negate the access issue to Hams Hall and Coleshill Industrial Estate.

These scenarios arrived at the following anticipated losses of rateable value via temporary disturbance appeals:

Scenario 1

1. Total Loss as a result of demolition
2. Blight prior to construction
3. Temporary losses during construction
4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability

| $£ 107,935$ | $2.04 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $£ 0$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| $£ 4,670, \mathbf{2 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 . 4 \%}$ |
| $£ 504,567$ | $9.6 \%$ |
| $£ 5,282,789$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Scenario 2

1. Total Loss as a result of demolition
£107,935 6.0\%
2. Blight prior to construction
3. Temporary losses during construction
4. Permanent losses due to a permanent disability

| $£ 0$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $£ \mathbf{£ 1 , 1 9 5 , 0 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 . 1 \%}$ |
| $£ 504,567$ | $27.9 \%$ |
| $£ £ 1,807,591$ | $100.0 \%$ |

However, the approach adopted was unable to take into account the fact that not all of the identified properties would be disturbed at the same time; instead providing a snapshot that assumed all construction took place at the same time. Given the nature of the construction project, some sections of the route would be subject to more intensive works at particular periods of time and it is reasonable to assume that the properties would warrant allowances (and especially the level of allowances identified in the report) only whilst the works were ongoing.

We have therefore been instructed to carry out a follow-up exercise which seeks to take the temporal nature of the works into account. It is hoped that this exercise would be better placed to provide an indication of likely impact on rateable values on an annual basis.

In order to achieve this, we have had regard to information provided by HS2 which sets out the anticipated construction timetable. It should be noted that plans are at a very preliminary stage and details in terms of construction programme provide a skeleton outline only. Nevertheless, we consider there to be available to us sufficient information necessary to carry out an initial analytical exercise.

We have taken hereditaments identified as part of the initial report and have again geocoded their locations onto maps. From there, we have also plotted the various phases on construction as identified by HS2. In this way, we have been able to estimate which hereditaments would be adversely affected for certain periods over the course of the construction timetable.

This data has been presented via postcode. Each postcode contains a number of assessments with each of those assessments having an allowance adopted depending on their mode of occupation. In this way, we have produced a blended allowance showing the net effect within each postcode.

We have maintained the allowances suggested in the original report, which were allowances based on the assumption that works were ongoing, but have only adopted those allowances whilst works are ongoing. For periods of dead time, when construction in a particular location has ceased or is yet to get underway, no allowance has been adopted.

Given the early stage at which the plans are currently, we have only been able to model this analysis on a quarterly basis, but this has nevertheless allowed us to build up a year by year picture.

It is necessary to add to each of these scenarios the rateable value that has been identified as at risk as a result of demolition. We maintain that the level of rateable value, as identified in our original report, provides a fair assessment of the quantum of this rateable value. We have assumed that the demolitions have been carried out as part of the enabling works and therefore are incorporated from the beginning of the construction period.

The permanent losses identified in the report have been invaded following the final year of construction on the basis that they are assumed to reflect operational disturbance and it would be inappropriate to include them at an earlier stage.

We present this data in an appended Gantt format for ease of understanding but confirm the following annual effects on rateable value based on the two scenarios:

Scenario 1 - Previous exercise showed $£ 5,282,789$

| Year | RV Loss via temp disturbance |  | RV loss through demolition |  | Permanent RV loss |  | Total Annual RV Loss |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017/18 | £ | 3,433,581.09 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 3,541,516.09 |
| 2018/19 | £ | 4,088,890.66 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 4,196,825.66 |
| 2019/20 | £ | 4,200,916.10 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 4,308,851.10 |
| 2020/21 | £ | 4,031,839.11 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 4,139,774.11 |
| 2021/22 | £ | 4,226,312.50 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 4,334,247.50 |
| 2022/23 | £ | 4,076,457.35 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 4,184,392.35 |
| 2023/24 | £ | 4,031,253.74 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 4,139,188.74 |
| 2024/25 | £ | 587,114.38 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 695,049.38 |
| 2025/26 | £ | 587,114.38 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 695,049.38 |
| 2026/27 | £ | 587,114.38 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 695,049.38 |
| 2027/28 | £ | 587,114.38 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 695,049.38 |
| 2028/29 | £ | - | £ | 107,935 | $£$ | 504,567 | £ | 612,502.00 |

Maximum Annual Disturbance - $£ 4,334,247$
Average Annual Disturbance - $£ 2,874,999$
Scenario 2 - $\quad$ Previous exercise showed $£ 1,807,591$

| Year | RV Loss via temp disturbance |  | RV loss through demolition |  | Permanent RV loss |  | Total Annual RV Loss |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017/18 | £ | 458,542.08 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 566,477.08 |
| 2018/19 | £ | 907,434.80 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 1,015,369.80 |
| 2019/20 | £ | 1,088,265.85 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 1,196,200.85 |
| 2020/21 | £ | 1,125,605.71 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 1,233,540.71 |
| 2021/22 | £ | 1,320,079.10 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 1,428,014.10 |
| 2022/23 | £ | 1,170,223.95 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 1,278,158.95 |
| 2023/24 | $£$ | 1,125,020.34 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 1,232,955.34 |
| 2024/25 | £ | 587,114.38 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 695,049.38 |
| 2025/26 | £ | 587,114.38 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 695,049.38 |
| 2026/27 | £ | 587,114.38 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 695,049.38 |
| 2027/28 | £ | 587,114.38 | £ | 107,935 | £ | - | £ | 695,049.38 |
| 2028/29 | £ | - | $£$ | 107,935 | $£$ | 504,567 | $£$ | 612,502.00 |

Maximum Annual Disturbance - $£ 1,428,014$
Average Annual Disturbance - $£ 975,537$

It can be seen that by modelling the likely impact on an annual basis, the maximum disturbance seen in any one year in our worst case scenario decreases by $18 \%$ ( $21 \%$ on best case scenario), with the average impact lessened by some $46 \%$ (also $46 \%$ on the best case scenario).

The average annual disturbance of $£ 975,537$ identified in Scenario 2 is substantially less than the $£ 9,037,037$ set out in the WH\&E report.
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## HS2 North Warwickshire -Estimated effect on Business Rate Income

## 1) Wilks Head and Eve

Wilks Head and Eve have been a highly respected partnership since its inception in 1972 from a merger of long established practices dating back to 1820 . The Practice has built a reputation for providing expert specialist advice in particular areas of surveying and valuation including rating valuation.

All our partners and associates are professionally qualified and have substantial experience in their fields including some who have previously held senior posts with the Valuation Office Agency and with Local Authorities.

## 2) Introduction

In January 2012, the Government gave the go ahead for the creation of Britain's second high-speed rail link known as HS2. It is to be developed in two phases; Phase 1 will go from London Euston to Lichfield with a spur into Birmingham's Curzon Street station with construction expected to begin in 2017 and open to passengers in 2026. Phase 2 will extend the line from Birmingham northwards to split off to both Manchester and Leeds. This report looks at the potential adverse impact on business premises as a result of the construction of the line both temporarily and permanently. This report will assess the likely direct impact on the local economy of the Borough and in turn on the finances of the Borough both in the short and long term.

It is suggested that HS2 poses a potential threat to private sector investment and regeneration in the Borough due to demolition, delays and uncertainty associated with HS2 and therefore to North Warwickshire's economy in terms of growth and job creation.

## 3) Instructions

We were instructed by Chris Brewer of NWBC on 23 September 2014. The date of this report is October 2014, and we have relied on information available as at that date including the hereditaments / valuations appearing at that date in the rating list.

## 4) Source of Information

We have had regard to information provided by Chris Brewer and colleagues of North Warwickshire Borough Council, and information currently contained in the Valuation Office rating list which is publically available information on the internet. Wilks Head and Eve have provided their opinion of the likely possible effect of HS2 on these existing rateable values.

## 5) Methodology

The Statutory definition of Rateable Value is as follows:
'the amount equal to the rent at which the property might reasonably be expected to let from year to year if the tenant undertook to pay all the usual tenant rates and taxes and bear the cost of repairs and insurance and other expenses (if any) necessary to maintain the property in a state to command that rent.

If a hereditament is affected by factors such as adjoining building works or other external factors that may have an effect on the hypothetical rental value of the property it is normal "custom and practice" in the absence of any actual rental evidence to apply a percentage reduction to the Rateable Value to reflect any disabilities which in hypothesis may affect rental values which we have done in this exercise.

We were provided with a list of addresses by NWBC which they considered could be "affected" by HS2. We plotted all these properties on to Ordnance Survey sheets (provided by the client) to ascertain their location in relation to the track bed. We then looked in detail at the location of these properties and considered whether they would be affected by the
construction and future use of HS2. We removed properties that we believe were remote from the construction.

We then looked at surrounding properties that we believed would be affected and added these to provide a comprehensive list of properties.

We were also provided with a property list of business premises/properties that could be demolished. These were again plotted on to the Ordnance Survey sheets. On plotting these properties it came to our attention that five properties are outside of the safeguarding zone and we believe there is only a slight chance of them being affected by the construction of HS2 and these have been removed from the list.

On our detailed analysis of the Ordnance plans we believe more properties could be identified as being at risk as they were surrounded by the safeguard area. The sites identified would become island sites surrounded by the safeguard area and therefore we believe could be at risk. We were therefore able to produce a list of properties that we believe could be affected by the construction of HS2.

We have then undertaken the following:

- In respect of every address that we identified - we have identified the 2010 Rating List assessment.
- Once identified we have collated the following information from the Valuation Office website:
- Assessment number
- Address
- Postcode
- Description
- Rateable Value
- Identified if appealed
- In appendix 1 we have attached the list showing the above information.
- From our analysis of this data we have determined a series of scales and allowances to reflect possible potential disability depending on location / description / extent of "disability."


## 6) Scales of allowances adopted to reflect "disabilities"

We then looked in detail at each Valuation Office description code and produced a table showing the 72 Description types that would be affected by HS2. We then analysed how many properties were in each description code and what the total Rateable value was per code - See Appendix 2.

We then grouped together the description codes in a logical order to arrive at six description categories: Offices, Retail, Industrial, Leisure, Non-Residential Institution and Miscellaneous.

On further refection we believed that in the Industrial Category Hams Hall and Coleshill Industrial Estate could be affected due to possible access problems if problems were encountered during the construction of HS2 and therefore a further industrial 2 category has been created-See Appendix 3.

We then used our expertise and Valuation knowledge of the Rating system to arrive at a set of possible scale of reductions that we believe could be achieved on each class of property. From our knowledge of the rating system we believe that approximately $75 \%$ of occupiers may appeal their Rating assessments.

| Description | Total RV | Scale | RV after Scale | Actual $£$ loss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Offices | £1,027,550 | 100\% | £1,027,550 | £513,775 |
| Retail | £420,000 | 100\% | £420,000 | £210,000 |
| Industrial | £804,760 | 100\% | £804,760 | £402,380 |
| Industrial 2 | £0 | 0 | £0 | £ |
| Leisure | £401,600 | 100\% | £401,600 | £200,800 |
| Non-Residential Institution | £3,650 | 100\% | £3,650 | £1,825 |
| Miscellaneous | $£ 479,040$ | 100\% | £479,040 | £239,520 |

£1,568,300

| B) Blight (prior to construction) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | Total RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scale | RV after Scale | Actual $£$ loss |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offices | $£ 1,402,000$ | $3.50 \%$ | $£ 49,070$ | $£ 24,535$ |  |  |  |
| Retail | $£ 684,786$ | $2.50 \%$ | $£ 17,120$ | $£ 8,600$ |  |  |  |
| Industrial | $£ 1,236,450$ | $7.50 \%$ | $£ 92,734$ | $£ 46,365$ |  |  |  |
| Industrial 2 | $£ 10,563,550$ | $5.00 \%$ | $£ 528,178$ | $£ 264,100$ |  |  |  |
| Leisure | $£ 2,496,500$ | $1.50 \%$ | $£ 37,500$ | $£ 17,725$ |  |  |  |
| Non-Residential Institution | $£ 39,000$ | $2.50 \%$ | $£ 975$ | $£ 488$ |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous | $£ 0$ | $0.00 \%$ | $£ 0$ | $£ 0$ |  |  |  |

£361,800

| C) Temporary Losses (during construction) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total RV | Scale | RV after Scale | Actual $£$ loss |  |  |
| Description | $£ 3,244,700$ | $12.50 \%$ | $£ 405,588$ | $£ 202,794$ |  |  |
| Offices | $£ 1,535,340$ | $7.50 \%$ | $£ 115,150$ | $£ 57,575$ |  |  |
| Retail | $£ 2,650,000$ | $15.00 \%$ | $£ 397,500$ | $£ 198,750$ |  |  |
| Industrial | $£ 25,742,211$ | $13.50 \%$ | $£ 3,475,198$ | $£ 1,737,599$ |  |  |
| Industrial 2 | $£ 3,045,400$ | $6.50 \%$ | $£ 197,951$ | $£ 98,976$ |  |  |
| Leisure | $£ 256,550$ | $5.00 \%$ | $£ 12,828$ | $£ 6,414$ |  |  |
| Non-Residential Institution | $£ 1,321,450$ | $5.00 \%$ | $£ 66,072$ | $£ 33,036$ |  |  |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |  | $£ 2,335,144$ |  |  |


| D) Permanent / disability Losses (due to permanent disability) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | Total RV | Scale | RV after Scale | Actual $£$ loss |
| Offices | $£ 1,482,000$ | $3.50 \%$ | $£ 51,870$ | $£ 25,900$ |
| Retail | $£ 720,617$ | $5.00 \%$ | $£ 36,000$ | $£ 18,000$ |
| Industrial | $£ 1,256,540$ | $15.00 \%$ | $£ 188,481$ | $£ 94,240$ |
| Industrial 2 | $£ 1,045,678$ | $12.50 \%$ | $£ 130,710$ | $£ 65,355$ |
| Leisure | $£ 2,496,500$ | $2.00 \%$ | $£ 49,900$ | $£ 25,000$ |
| Non-Residential Institution | $£ 20,300$ | $2.00 \%$ | $£ 406$ | $£ 200$ |
| Miscellaneous | $£ 1,180,000$ | $4.00 \%$ | $£ 47,200$ | $£ 23,600$ |

£252,295

## 7) Conclusions

## A) Total loss

Permanent loss of business rates through demolition of commercial premises as a result of construction of HS2.

The total RV of the properties found is $£ 3,136,600$ We have assumed that all of these properties will be demolished as it is unclear which ones will be kept and which ones will not at the time of writing this report. The total lost predicted is $£ 1,568,300$.

## B) Blight

Once the order for HS2 has been confirmed it is possible that occupiers may appeal their assessments before any construction works commence on the assumption that rental values (and therefore RV) have been blighted by the scheme. This is due to the Statutory definition of Rateable Value which we have quoted in the Methodology which states that 'the property might reasonably be expected to let from 'year to year' which could have an effect on value. The total lost predicted is $£ 361,800$.

## C) Temporary Rateable value loss during construction works.

A number of businesses will suffer disruption to their business as a result of the construction phase of HS2 and will seek a reduction in their rateable value to compensate. These reductions form temporary disability allowances to reflect noise, dust, disturbance, access difficulties, etc.

We believe that Hams Hall and Coleshill Industrial Estate will be most affected.

We anticipate that the total loss of will be in the region of $£ 2,335,144$. We anticipate that these allowances will prevail for 7 to 10 years.

## D) Permanent disability loss

Some businesses which continue to trade will be permanently affected by HS2 and may be able to secure permanent disability allowances due to noise / dust / disturbance.

We anticipate that the total loss will be in the region of $£ 252,295$ due to the permanent impact HS2 will have on their business.

## 8) Opportunity loss and Betterment

## A) Opportunity loss

North Warwickshire could lose out on enhancing Rateable Value arising out of developments no longer viable. We have also been informed that HS2 will also impact with suggested planning blight on approximately $74,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of land with planning permission for employment purposes.

The ability to move substantial business premises within the Borough is limited due to the Green Belt designation which covers $60 \%$ of the Borough.

## B) Possible Betterment

During the construction of HS2 there may be some betterment but very small in terms of Rateable Value for example contractor's huts and temporary contractors facilities. There could be possible betterment in the future due to enhanced trade brought about due to HS2, ie trade enhanced by the construction workforce but at the time of producing this report the added value is unquantifiable in terms of Rateable Value.

## C) Permanent allowances post completion to reflect material changes in circumstances following completion of works.

There could be a potential for rateable value loss as a result of firms moving outside of the Borough because of the impact of construction of HS2 on their businesses. These businesses could suffer loss due to loss of part of the premises, permanent inconveniences, access alterations etc.

## 9) Assumptions and Caveats

## a) State of Repair

We have not made any inspections of the properties affected by the HS2 proposal.
We have assumed that the properties are in a good state of repair and condition, in accordance with the Rating Statutory definition (which reflects what we would call the obligations of repair under a full repairing lease).

## b) Services

We have assumed that all the properties have the relevant services ie electricity, sewage and water connected. No inspection or testing of these services has been undertaken.

## c) Deleterious or Hazardous Substances

We have not arranged for any investigations to be carried out to determine whether or not any deleterious or hazardous material has previously been used on the site of any of the properties. We are therefore unable to report that these sites are risk free in this respect. For the purposes of this exercise, we have assumed that such investigation would not disclose the presence of any such material to any significant extent. If significant contamination were to be discovered this may affect possible assessments.

## d) Rateable Values

We have taken Rateable Values currently at the date of this report. We have made no allowance for any existing or outstanding appeals. The Rateable Values adopted are from the existing 2010 list. By the time the construction starts it is likely that the 2017 Rating List will be in force and therefore reductions may be against a revised Rating List and financial base. At this stage it is not possible to estimate the total change as a result of the Revaluation but the effects we have forecast should be broadly pro rata for any changes in the Valuation list.

## e) Rate Poundage

The rate in the pound is set annually by Central Government and will normally increase in line with inflation. For 2014/15, the Small Business multiplier, applicable to those businesses eligible for Small Business Rate Relief, was set at 47.1p. The 2014/15 Standard Multiplier is 48.2 p for $2014 / 15$ for a property with a Rateable Value of over £18,000.

To allow for inflation we have used a multiplier of 0.50p.

## f) Catastrophic Events

We have made no allowances for the potential effect of a totally unexpected event that may affect occupations adversely. We assume that the HS2 project will seek to mitigate with all reasonable skill the effects on the surrounding occupants.

## g) Allowances Adopted

At this stage we can only speculate on the levels of disturbance and negative effect on individual businesses. Allowances against Rateable Value will need to be prosecuted on appeal by the appellant with sufficient evidence to support a case for an allowance against "rent."

## Confidentiality and None Publication Clause

This report has been produced for North Warwickshire Borough Council and their advisors only and is not to be used by any third party in respect of any disputes.

Neither the whole nor any part of this report or advice or references to it may be included in any published document without the consent of Wilks Head and Eve. The report has been provided solely for the purposes of North Warwickshire Borough Council and cannot be relied upon by any other party.

The estimates of RV loss in this report should not be adopted by any occupier referred to in this report as any confirmation that there will indeed be a successful appeal resulting in an RV reduction. Wilks Head and Eve bear no responsibility in this respect.

Wilks Head and Eve
10 October 2014

## APPENDIX 1 - Property Information downloaded from the Valuation Office website



| C.11 | T-MOBILE (93083) AT COLESHILL DEPOT, COLESHILL HEATH ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511928200429 | COMMUNICATION STATION AND <br> PREMISES | £6,150 | ¢6,400 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CC12 | HUTCHISON $3 G$ SITE CVOO81 AT HAWKESWELL FARM, HAWKESWELL LANE, COLESHILL, BRRMINGHAM | 511929900051 | COMMUNICATION STATION AND premises | £5,000 | £5,900 |
| CC14 | CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFELD, WEST MIDLANOS | 512237500180 | PREMISES | £6,150 | £6,400 |
| CC15 | RADIO MAST AT DUNTON COPPICE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300060 | COMMUNICATION STATION AND PREMISES | £5,125 | £5,600 |
| CC17 | 02 SITE 5751 AT RYE FARM, RYEFIELD LANE, WISHAW, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 518797700061 | COMMUNICATION STATION AND PREMISES | £6,150 | £6,400 |
| CC18 | T-MOBILE (95231) NG PYLON ZF 80, TAMWORTH ROAD, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872400011 | COMMUNICATION STATION AND premises |  | ¢7,700 |
| CC19 | VODAPHONE CELLULAR LTD SPARTAN UNITY SPORTS GROUND, COPPICE LANE, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514871300000 | COMMUNICATION STATHON AND PREMISES | £7,000 | £9,400 |
| CC20 | ORANGE (WAR0046) AT KINGSBURY SCHOOL, TAMWORTH ROAD, KINGSBURY, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514260700335 | COMMUNICATION STATION AND PREMISES | £8,000 | £11,250 |
| $\mathrm{CC21}$ | VODAFONE SITE 7528 AT FORMER LITTLE CHEF, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, MERIDEN, COVENTRY | 515775350273 | COMMUNICATION STATION ANO PREMISES | £2,100 | £2,800 |
| CC21 | VODAFONE SITE 5836 PYLON ROADSIDE, CUTTLE MILL LANE, WISHAW, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS, B76 9PU | 512236900012 | COMMUNICATION STATION AND PREMISES | 6150 | ¢6,400 |
| CC16 | TELECOM TOWER AT HALL FARM, FARTHING LANE, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237000103 | COMMUNLCATION STATION AND PREMSIES | £5,700 | £6,300 |
|  |  |  |  |  | f.155,940 |
| COM1 | THE OLD MARKET HALL, CHURCH HILL, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3AD | 511927800011 | COMMUNITY CENTRE AND EXHIBIIION AREA | ¢6,200 | £6,200 |
| COM1 | ADJ COLESHILL HIGH SCHOOL, PACKINGTON LANE, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3JE | 511931400320 | COMMUNITY CENTRE AND PREM | ¢ 3,800 | £3,800 |
| COM 2 | COMMUNITY CENTRE, TEMPLE WAY, COLESHLL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1HN | 511933401000 | COMMUNITY CENTRE AND PREMISES | £8,200 | £8,200 |
|  |  |  |  |  | £.18,200 |
| CBP1 | DOUGLAS CONCRETE LTD, GORSEY LANE, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 IU | 511929301000 | CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT AND PREMISES | 24250 | £32,250 |
| CBP2 | DOUGLAS CONCRETE LTO, GORSEY LANE, COLESHLLL, BIRMINGHAM, B4G 1 U | 511929301000 | CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT AND PREMISES | $£ 24,250$ | £32,250 |
| CBW1 | THERMALITE LTD, HAMS HALL, LEA MARSTON, SUTTON COLOFIELD, WEST MIDLANOS, B76OBQ | 514564100020 | CONCRETE BLOCK WORK AND PREMISES | £ 340,000 | £352,500 |
| CON1 | MIDDLETON HALL PIT, CONEYBURY FARM, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872400191 | CONCRETE PRODUCT WORKS AND PREMISES | £10,750 | £14,250 |
|  |  |  |  |  | £431,250 |
| CG1 | CRICKET CLUB, COLESHILL ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, B46 10 X | 518189200331 | CRICKET GROUND AND PREMISES | ¢6,350 | £6,300 |
| CG2 | CRICKET GROUND, CHURCH LANE, WISHAW, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIOLANOS | 518797100150 | CRICKET GROUND AND PREMISES | £4,100 | £4,400 |
|  |  |  |  |  | £10,700 |
| D1 | COMMUNITY FACILITY BUILDING AT WATER ORTON FIRST SCHOOL, ATTLEBOROUGHLANE, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1SB | 518188900013 | DAY NURSERY AND PREMISES | £3,750 | £4,500 |
| D2 | TEDDY N DAISYS DAY NURSERY, COVENTRY ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511928400608 | DAY NURSERY ANO PREMISES | £25,250 | £29,750 |
| 04 | KINGSBURY CHILDRENS CENTRE AT KINGSBURY PRIMARY SCHOOL, BROMAGE AVENUE, KINGSBURY, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514257000671 | DAY NURSERY AND PREMISES | £5,400 | £5,900 |
| D3 | KINGSBURY CHILORENS CENTRE AT KINGSBURY PRIMARY SCHOOL, BROMAGE AVENUE, KINGSBURY, TAMWORTH, STAFFS, B78 2 HN | 514257000671 | DAY NURSERY ANO PREMISES | £5,400 | £5,900 |
| D2 | MIDDLETON COMMUNITY CENTRE, CHURCH LANE, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514871100000 | DAY NURSEY ANO PREMISES | £10,750 | £ 11,500 |
|  |  |  |  |  | f.57,550 |
| ELC1 | PACKINGTON LANDFILL STTE, PACKINGTON LANE, LITTLE PACKINGTON, COVENTRY | 515875700700 | ELECTRICITY GENERATING PLANT AND PREMISES | £160,000 | £212,000 |
| F1 | BMW HAMS HALL, CANTON LANE, LEA MARSTON, SUTTON COLDFEELD, WEST MIDLANDS, 8461 1G8 | 514564120010 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £3,690,000 | £3,940,000 |
| F2 | FLEXICON, ROMAN WAY, COLESHHLL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 HG | 511932300401 | GACTORY AND PREMISES |  | ¢247,000 |
| F3 | UNIT 1 FORMER MPS ROMAN WAY COLESHILL BIRMINGHAM B46 1 HG | 511932300001 | FACTORY ANO PREMISES |  | ¢75,250 |
| F4 | UNIT 10, ROMAN WAY, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1HG | 511932300102 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £43,250 | £42,750 |
| F5 | UNIT 2 FORMER MSP, ROMAN WAY, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 HG | 511932300002 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £ 38,250 |
| F6 | UNIT 3 FORMER MSP, ROMAN WAY, COLESHHLL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 HG | 511932300003 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £40,750 |
| F7 | UNIT 3 ROMAN PARK, ROMAN WAY, COLESHIL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 HG | 511932300521 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £56,000 | £49,000 |
| F8 | AMBER UPVC FABRICATIONS, AMBER HOUSE, ROMAN WAY, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1HO | 511932300303 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £167,000 | £156,000 |
| F9 | UNIT 21, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1HT | 511932910211 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £16,000 |
| F10 | CABLE MANAGEMENT PRODUCTS LTD CMG HOUSE, STATION ROAD, COLESHHL, BIRMINGHAM, 8961 HT | 511932910003 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £114,000 | £122,000 |
| F11 | UNIT 2A, BLOOMFIELD HOUSE 24A, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 HT | 511932910041 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £13,500 |
| F12 | SAFEWAY SCAFFOLDING LTO, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 $118$ | 511932920680 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £48,250 | £47,750 |
| F13 | UNIT 23, COLESHILL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BRMMINGAM, B46 1/P | 511932920230 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £15,750 |
| F14 | UNIT 31, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1]P | 511932920311 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £16,500 |
| F15 | UNIT 32, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 846 1JP | 511932920321 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £15,750 |
| F16 | UNIT 42, COLESHILL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHLLL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 IJP | 511932920420 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £15,750 |


| F17 | UNITS 15-17 \& 19-20, COLESHILL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 846119 | 511932920384 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £59,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F18 | UNITS 29 \& 30 , COLESHILL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BiRMINGHAM, B46 1JP | 511932920290 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £21,250 |
| F19 | UNITS 34-38, COLESHILL INOUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, BA6 UP BIRMINGHAM, B46 1JP | 511932920386 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £124,000 |
| F20 | UNIT 46, COLESHIL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 13T | 511932920460 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £19,500 |
| F21 | UNIT 51, COLESHIL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 IHT | 511932920510 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £16,500 |
| F22 | UNIT 60, COLESHILLINOUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 TT | 511932920600 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £16,250 |
| F23 | COLESHILL ALUMINIUM LTD, GORSEY LANE, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 $13 \cup$ | 511929300009 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £43,500 | £41,000 |
| F24 | UNIT 12A, GORSEY LANE, COIESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1JU | 511929300005 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £11,000 | f10,750 |
| F25 | UNIT 128, GORSEY LANE, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 11 U | 511929300004 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | ¢10,750 | ¢9,800 |
| F26 | UNIT 14, GORSEY LANE, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 8463 IU | 511929300006 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £29,250 | £30,750 |
| NO | 1, THE CEDARS, COTON ROAD, NETHER WHITACRE, BTRMINGHAM, B46 2 HH | 518393600952 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £44,750 | £42,750 |
| NO | 2, THE CEDARS, COTON ROAD, NETHER WHITACRE, BIRMINGHAM, B46 2HH | 518393600953 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £78,500 | ¢82,500 |
| NO | 6.7, THE CEDARS, COTON ROAD, NETHER WHITACRE, BIRMINGHAM, B46 2 HH | 518393600961 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £59,000 |
| F27 | PRO-MIL ENGINEERING LTD AT QUARRY WORKS, BODYMOOR REATH LANE, BODYMOOR HEATH, SUTTON COLDFELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 514256850062 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £100,000 | £101,000 |
| F30 | 8ULDING 2 W H SMITH \& SON ITD, WATER ORTON LANE, MINWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 518192750012 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | £141,000 |
| F29 | VEKA GROUP, WATER ORTON LANE, MINWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIOLANDS | 51819250012 | FACTORY AND PREMISES |  | ¢157,000 |
| F28 | WHS PLASTICS LTD, WATER ORTON LANE, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM | 518193050030 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £287,500 | £290,000 |
| F29 | UNIT 6, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANOS | 512237300421 | FACTORY ANO PREMISES | £ 15,000 | £14,000 |
| F30 | UNITS C D \& E, KINGSBURY ROAD, CUROWORTR, SUTTON COLDFFELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300622 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £91,500 | ¢93,000 |
| F31 | CHARLESWORTH \& SON, WISHAW LANE, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300450 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £26,750 | £27,750 |
| F31 | PERMAT MACHINES LTD, STATION ROAD, COLESHIL, BIRMINGHAM, BA6 $1 / \mathrm{G}$ | 511929300057 | FACTORY AND PREMISES | £64,500 | £67,500 |
| F32 | BEAVER METALS LTD, MARSH LANE, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1SN | 518190600003 | FACFORY AND PREMISES | £77,500 | £124,000 |
| F33 | HT BRIGHAM \& COLTD, STATION ROAD, COLESHIL, SIRMINGHAM, B46 110 | 511932910060 | FACTORY \& PREMISES | 84500 | 82500 |
| F34 | UNIT 59 GORSEY LANE, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 11 U | 511929300012 | FACTORY \& PREMISES | 32250 | 34000 |
| FS1 |  |  |  |  | £6,516,800 |
|  | Fine stalion, PARK ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 846 1DJ | 511931600040 | FIRE STATION AND PREMISES | £45,000 | £51,000 |
| FG1 | COLESHLL TOWN FOOTBALL CLUB, PACKINGTON LANE, COLESHML, BIRMINGHAM, 846 3IE | 511931400340 | FOOTBALL GROUND AND PREMISES | £3,500 | £3,400 |
| FT1 | HAMS HALL FREIGHT TERMINAL, HAMS LANE, LEA MARSTON, SUTTON COLDFFLD, WEST MIDLANDS | 514564100043 | FREIGHT TERMINAL AND PREMISES | £120,000 | £125,000 |
| GP1 | CURDWORTH GARAGE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANOS | 512237300430 | GARAGE AND PREMISES | £11,000 | £10,750 |
| GP2 | CEDAR HOUSE, KINGSBURY ROAD, LEA MARSTON, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS, B760DS | 514564400200 | GARAGE AND PREMISES | £21,750 | ¢22,250 |
|  |  |  |  |  | £33,000 |
| GC1 | MELBICK NURSERIES, CHESTER ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511927600060 | GARDEN CENTRE | £400,000 | $£ 420,000$ |
| GC2 | COPPICE GARDEN CENTRE, COPPICE LANE, MIDOLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514871300370 | GARDEN CENTRE AND PREMISES |  | £40,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | £460,000 |
| 6CO1 | STONEBRIDGE GOLF CENIRE, SOMERS ROAD, GREAT PACKINGTON, COVENTRY | 515775480000 | GOLF COURSE AND PREMISES | £68,250 | £87,500 |
| GHi | BLYTHEWOOD GUEST HOUSE 39, BLYTHE ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, BAG AAF | 511926610331 | GUEST HOUSE AND PREMISES | £2,550 | £2,700 |
| GH2 | JAMES GUEST HOUSE 12, ROSE ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1EH | 511932400121 | GUEST HOUSE AND PREMISES | £3,200 | ¢4,250 |
| GH3 | DORSET COTTAGE 202, COVENTRY ROAD, COLESHHL, BIRMINGHAM | 511928402020 | GUEST HOUSE AND PREMISES | f6,100 | $£ 5,200$ |
| GH4 | OLD SCHOOL HOUSE HOTEL, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300472 | GUEST HOUSE AND PREMISES | ¢7,400 | £ ¢, 500 |
| GH5 | HIGHFIELD FARM, FARTHING LANE, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237000120 | GUEST HOUSE AND PREMISES | ¢5,600 | £7,600 |
| GH6 | MIDDLETON HOUSE FARM, TAMWORTH ROAD, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872500040 | GUEST HOUSE AND PREMISES | £4,000 | ¢4,400 |
| 6H7 | REINDEER PARK HOTEL, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFFELD, WEST MIDLANDS, B76 ODE | 512237300800 | GUEST HOUSE AND PREMISES | £ 3,600 | £4,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | ¢ 36,650 |
| H1 | R/O WHITACRE METHODIST CHURCH 56, STATION ROAD, NETHER WHITACRE, BIRMINGHAM, B46 2EH | 518394900560 | HAIRDRESSING SALON ANO PREMISES | £430 | £S30 |
| H2 | 75, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, B:RMINGHAM, 846 3AG | 511930100755 | HAIRDRESSING SALON AND PREMISES | £6,000 | £7,600 |






| 0132 | 2 NO FLR AT TA, COVENTRY ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3 B | 511928400078 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £6,400 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0133 | 7, COVENTRY ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BB | 511928400071 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £7,600 | ¢8,000 |
| 0134 | 9, COVENTRY ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 38B | 511928400091 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £8,600 | £9,100 |
| 0135 | GND FLR AT 7A, COVENTRY ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 8463 B8 | 511928400079 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £11,250 |
| 0136 | WINGFFELD COURT, COVENTRY ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BE | 511928400210 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | ¢74,000 | £70,500 |
| 0137. | PERFECT HARMONY AT COLESHILL TOWN HALL, SUMNER ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3 BG | 511933100012 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | < 4,00 | £3,350 |
| 0138 | GNO FLR UNIT A SUMNER HOUSE, SUMNER ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BH | 511931700911 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £9,800 |
| 0139 | 1ST FLR AT COLESHIEL TOWN HALL 142, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 846 3BJ | S11930101431 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £7,000 |
| O140. | PRT GND \& PRT 1ST FLR FRONT 140, HIGH STREET, COLESH:LL, BIRMINGHAM, 846381 | 511930101342 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £8,200 | ¢7,800 |
| 0141. | 1ST FLOOR FRONT R/H SIDE OVER 92-94, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BL | 511930100927 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £2,850 | £2,800 |
| 0142 | 1ST FLOOR (FRONT) 102-104, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BL | 511930101034 | OFFICES ANO PREMISES | £6,700 | £6,700 |
| 0143 | 1ST FLOOR FRONT R/H SIDE OVER 92-94, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BL | 511930100927 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £2,850 | £2,800 |
| 0144 | 1ST FLR (MIDDLE) 102-104, HIGH STREET, COLESHIL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BL | 511930101035 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £3,200 | £3,150 |
| 0145 | 2ST FLR (REAR) 102-104, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 38 L | 511930101030 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | ¢5,900 | ¢6,000 |
| 0145 | 1 STFLR 112, HIGH STREET, COLESHIL, BIRMINGHAM, 8463 36 | 511930101132 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £16,750 | £17,000 |
| 0149. | SECOND FLOOR 102-104, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BFRMINGHAM, B46 3 BL | 511930101028 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £3,800 | £3,550 |
| 0150 | 103A, HIGH STREET, COLESHIL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 38P | 512930101032 | OFFICES ANO PREMISES | £12,500 | £15,250 |
| 0151 | 131, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511930101312 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £51,500 |
| 0152 | MILER BRIGGS \& CO, CLINTON HOUSE, HIGH STREET, COLESHHLL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BP | 511930101331 | OFFICES ANO PREMISES | £7,500 | ¢7,900 |
| 0153 | ROOM 16 THE ANNEXE CHANTRY HOUSE, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511930101401 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £1,325 | £1,225 |
| 0154 | ROOMS 11 \& 17, THE ANNEXE, CHANTRY HOUSE, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL., BIRMINGHAM | 511930101575 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £2,275 |
| 0155 | ROOMS 12 \& 18, THE ANNEXE, CHANTRY HOUSE, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511930101576 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £1,950 |
| 0155 | ROOMS 13-14, THE ANNEXE, CHANTRY HOUSE, HIGH STREET, COLESHIL, BIRMINGHAM | 511930101493 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | ¢3,000 | £2,850 |
| 0157. | ROOMS 1-4 THE ANNEXE, CHANTRY HOUSE, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511930101448 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £4,500 | £4,050 |
| 0158 | ROOMS 5-8 THE ANNEXE, CHANTRY HOUSE, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511930101447 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £ 3,250 |
| 0159 | ROOMS 9-10, THE ANNEXE, CHANTRY HOUSE, HIGH STREET, COLESHHLL, BIRMINGHAM | 511930101574 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £1,050 |
| 0160 | UNIT 1OA, THE COURTYARD, ROMAN WAY, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511932300334 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £14,250 | £12,500 |
| 0161 | UNIT 108, THE COURTYARO, ROMAN WAY, COLESHLLL, BIRMINGHAM | 511932300335 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £12,000 | f11,750 |
| 0162 | UNIT S, THE COURTYARO, ROMAN WAY, COLESHIL, BIRMINGHAM | 511932300262 | OFFICES ANO PREMISES | ¢24,750 | £22,500 |
| 0163 | UNIT 9A, THE COURTYARD, ROMAN WAY, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511932300332 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £14,500 | £12,500 |
| 0164 | YORK HOUSE, THE COURTYARD, ROMAN WAY, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511932300260 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £24,250 | £22,250 |
| 0165 | 15 F FLR S8-60, COVENTRY ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511928400604 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | ¢14,750 | ¢16,750 |
| 0166 | THE MEDIA COLLECTIVE, THE PIGGERIES, SOUTHFFELDS FARM, PACKINGTON LANE, COLESHHLL, BIRMINGHAM | 511931400031 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £20,500 | ¢24,500 |
| 0167 | 21, COVENTRY ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511928400212 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £43,500 | £46,500 |
| 0168 | GND FLR S, COVENTRY ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511928400054 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | ¢3,500 | f3,550 |
| 0169 | MOTORWAY COMPUTER CENTRE, COLESHILL HEATH ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511928200451 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £61,000 | f61,500 |
| 0170 | 1ST FLR AT UNIT 12, QUARTZ POINT, STONEBRIDGE ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511933000127 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | 61,00 | £20,000 |
| 0171 | GND FLR AT UNIT 12, QUARTZ POINT, STONEBRIDGE ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511933000126 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £20,250 |
| 0172 | UNIT 10, QUARTZ POINT, STONEBRIOGE ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511933000105 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £40,500 |
| 0173 | UNIT 11, QUART2 POINT, STONEBRIDGE ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511933000115 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £40,500 |
| 0174 | UNIT 3, QUARTZ POINT, STONEBRIDGE ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511933000036 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £ 37,250 |
| 0175 | UNIT 4, QUARTZ POINT, STONERRIDGE ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511933000045 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | ¢ 37,250 |
| 0176 | UNIT S, QUARTZ POINT, STONEBRIDGE ROAD, COLESHHLL, BIRMINGHAM | 511933000055 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £47,000 |
| 0177 | UNIT 6, QUARTZ POINT, STONEBRIDGE ROAD, COLESHLLL, BIRMINGHAM | 511933000065 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £46,500 |
| 0178 | UNIT 7, QUARTL POINT, STONEBRIDGE ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511933000075 | OFFICES ANO PREMISES |  | £44,750 |
| 0179 | UNIT 8, QUARTZ POINT, STONEBRIDGE ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511933000085 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | ¢ 38,500 | £44,750 |
| 0180 | UNIT 9, QUARTZ POINT, STONEBRIDGE ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMING HAM | 511933000095 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £40,500 |
| 0181 | UNITS 1-2, QUARTZ POINT, STONEBRIDGE ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511933000015 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £58,000 | £71,000 |
| 0182 | UNITS 1-2, QUARTZ POINT, STONEBRIDGE ROAD, COLESHHL, BIRMINGHAM | 511933000015 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £58,000 | £71,000 |


| 0183 | 45, PARKFIELD ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B463LD | 511931700453 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £11,500 | £10,750 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0185 | 1 ST FLR UNIT A SUMNER HOUSE, PARKFIELD COURT, PARKFIELD ROAD, COLESHLLL, BRRMINGHAM | 511931700920 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | ¢7,700 | ¢7,400 |
| 0187 | 37A, PARKFIELD ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511931700903 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £26,250 | £23,250 |
| 0188 | GND FLR THE COACH HOUSE 25A, PARKFIELD ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511931700253 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £5,500 | £6,900 |
| 0189 | THE BEECHES 37, PARKFIELO ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511931700902 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £18,000 | £16,250 |
| 0189 | SUITE 1, CURDWORTH HOUSE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300506 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £6,000 | £6,600 |
| 0190 | SUITE 13, CURDWORTH HOUSE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300512 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £3,850 | £4,300 |
| 0191 | SUITE 14A, CURDWORTH HOUSE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANOS | 512237300142 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £13,500 | £14,750 |
| 0192 | SUITE 2, CUROWORTH HOUSE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANOS | 512237300507 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £15,250 |
| 0193 | SUITE 2A, CURDWORTH HOUSE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CUROWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300502 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £14,500 |
| 0194 | SUTTE 3, CURDWORTH HOUSE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CUROWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300497 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £15,750 | £17,500 |
| 0195 | SUITE 6, CURDWORTH HOUSE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300508 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £29,250 | £31,750 |
| 0196 | SUITE 7, CURDWORTH HOUSE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANOS | 512237300509 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £15,750 | ¢17,500 |
| 0197 | SUITE 8, CURDWORTH HOUSE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLOFIELD, WEST M:OLANDS | 512237300510 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £3,750 | £4,150 |
| 0198 | SUITES $4 \& 5$, CURDWORTH HOUSE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CUROWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300503 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £ 56,000 |
| 0199 | SUITES 9-12, CURDWORTH HOUSE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300511 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | ¢58,500 | £61,500 |
| 0200 | WATFORD ELEGTRONICS 1ST FLOOR PT UNIT 5, FAIRVIEW INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300647 | OFFICES ANO PREMISES | ¢6,800 | £7,600 |
| 0201 | GRD FLOOR UNIT 3, FAIRVIEW INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CUROWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANOS | 512237300580 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £4,700 | £4,800 |
| 0202 | PT UNIT 2, FAIRVIEW INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300588 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £13,000 | £13,750 |
| 0203 | PGA TRAINING CENTRE \& OFFICES, THE BELFRY HOTEL, LICHFIELD ROAD, WISHAW, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 518797600300 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £ 114,000 | £114,000 |
| 0204 | OAK BARN AT MIDDLETON HOUSE FARM, TAMWORTH ROAD, MIDOLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872400181 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £8,700 | £10,250 |
| 0205 | THE GRANARY \& CONFERENCE ROOM, MIDDLETON HOUSE FARM, TAMWORTH ROAD, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872400180 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £9,600 | £11,000 |
| 0206 | THE MLL HOUSE, MIDDLETON HOUSE FARM, TAMWORTH ROAD, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872400179 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £2,500 | £2,850 |
| 0207 | THE GRANARY, GRANARY PLACE, KINGSEURY, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514257600010 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | ¢15,500 |
| 0208 | UNIT 1, MILL FARM BARNS, PACKINGTON PARK, MERIDEN, COVENTRY | 515875700051 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £9,700 | £11,750 |
| 0209 | UNIT 2, MILL farm barns, PACKINGTON PARK, MERIDEN, COVENTRY | 515875700052 | OFFECES AND PREMISES | £6,100 | £7,400 |
| 0210 | UNIT 3, MIL PARM BARNS, PACKINGTON PARK, MERIDEN, COVENTRY | 515875700053 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £10,750 | £13,000 |
| 0211 | UNIT 4, MIL FARM BARNS, PACKINGTON PARK, MERIDEN, COVENTRY | 515875700054 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £14,500 | £18,000 |
| 0212 | UNIT 5, MIL FARM BARNS, PACKINGTON PARK, MERIDEN, COVENTRY | 515875700055 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £4,100 | £4,850 |
| 0213 | 2 ND FLR AT PACKINGTON HALL, PACKINGTON PARK, GREAT PACKINGTON, COVENTRY | 515775350011 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £20,000 | £32,750 |
| 0214 | HARRIS \& SHELDON NORTH COURT PACKINGYON HALL, PACKINGTON PARK, GREAT PACKINGTON, COVENTRY | 515775350019 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £60,000 | ¢64,000 |
| 0215 | PACKINGTON REPEATER STATION, COVENTRY ROAD, GREAT PACKINGTON, COVENTRY | 515775350300 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £4,100 | ¢4,800 |
| 0215 | BLYTHE STABLES, PACKINGTON LANE, LITtLE PACKINGTON, COVENTRY | 515875700228 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £16,500 | £19,500 |
| 0216 | CHURCH FARM BARN, PACKINGTON LANE, LITTE PACKINGTON, COVENTRY | 515875700229 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | Deleted |
| 0217 | WOOD RYDINGS COURT, PACKINGTON LANE, IITTLE PACKINGTON, COVENTRY | 515875700227 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £23,000 |
| 0220 | CAMPGELL REFTH PT AST FLR, CHANTRY HOUSE, HIGH STREET, COLESHFLL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 2AX | 511930101451 | OFFICES AND PREMISES | £4,100 | $£ 3,950$ |
| 0184 | $15 T$ FLR THE COACH HOUSE 25A, PARKFIELD ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511931700254 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £7,100 |
| 0186 | 2ND FLR THE COACH HOUSE 25A, PARKFIELO ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511931700255 | OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £1,975 |
| 0147 | GF MIDDLE 102-104, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BL | 511930101022 | OFFICES, OFFICE AND PREMISES | ¢ 4,200 | £3,850 |
| 0148 | GF REAR 102-104, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, $81 \mathrm{RMINGHAM}$, | 511930101021 | OFFICES, OFFICE AND PREMISES | ¢6,100 | £5,500 |
| OSP1 | UNIT 39, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 IJP | 511932920385 | OFFICES, STORE AND PREMISES | £13,000 | £19,250 |
| 0235 | R/O COLESHILL FREIGHT, STATION ROAD, COLESHHL, BIRMINGHAM, 8461 ITT | 511932910891 | OFFICES \& PREMISES | 1500 | 1500 |
| 0236 | COMMITTEE ROOMS, SUMNER ROAD, COLESHHL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BH | 511933100011 | OFFICES \& PREMISES | 5100 | 4600 |
| 0237 | LAKE HOUSE, 7 PARKFIELD ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3 LO | 511931700951 | OFFICES \& PREMISES | 8200 | 7900 |
| TWR1 | EX PUBEIC CONVENIENCE, COVENTRY ROAD, KINGSBURY, TAMWORTH, B78 | 514257600379 | TAXI WAITING ROOM \& OFFICES | 730 | 1000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4,672,125 |



|  |  |  |  |  | £420,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH1 | SCOUT HUT, BIRMANGHAM ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, 84615 L | 518189000482 | SCOUT HUT | £2,100 | £2,150 |
| SMO1 | HAWKESWELL FARM, HAWKESWELL LANE, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511929900050 | SEMI-AUTOMATIC METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVING SYSTEM | £2,500 | £3,000 |
| ST2 | SLUDGE DESTRUCTION PLANT, LICHFIELD ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLOFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS, B46 $1 E G$ | 512237500170 | SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS AND PREMISES | £105,000 | £143,000 |
| 572 | SEWAGE WORKS, LICHFIELD ROAD, COLESHHLL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 JEG | 511930700870 | SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS AND PREMISES | £615,000 | £930,000 |
| ST3 | SEWAGE WORKS, CHURCH LANE, MIDOLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514871100820 | SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS AND PREMISES | £6,700 | £8,700 |
| NO | SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS COLESHLLL BIRMINGHAM B46 2LE | 517485500210 | SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS AND PREMISES | £3,500 | £4,900 |
|  |  |  |  |  | £1,086,600 |
| SP1 | 69, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 8461 AY | 511930100690 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £14,500 | £17,500 |
| SP1 | 14, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1AZ | 511930100140 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £1,475 | £2,650 |
| SP2 | 58, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 AZ | 511930100580 | SHOP AND PREMISES | ¢6,200 | £6,900 |
| SP4 | 1, BRIDGE VIEW, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1BE | 511930100014 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £3,150 | £5,600 |
| SP5 | 3, BRIDGE VIEW, HIGH STREET, COLESHHLL, BIRMINGHAM, 846618 E | 511930100022 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £3,150 | £5,600 |
| SP6 | 5, BRIDGE VIEW, HIGH STREET, COLESHHLL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 18E | 511930100023 | SHOP AND PREMIISES | £3,150 | £5,600 |
| SP7 | 7-8, 8RIDGE VIEW, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1BE | 511930100026 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £3,150 | £5,600 |
| SP8 | 9, BRIDGE VIEW, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1BE | 511930100028 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £4,500 | £8,000 |
| SP4 | 50, LICHFIELD ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1EG | 511930700501 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £2,800 | £3,350 |
| SP10 | DILLONS NEWSAGENTS, STATION ROAD, COLESHHL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 HT | 511932910026 | SHOP AND PREMISES | ¢5,800 | ¢5,500 |
| SP11 | 19, EDWARD ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1PG | 518189500190 | SHOP AND PREMISES | $£ 3,350$ | £3,450 |
| SP12 | 7, COLESHILL ROAD, WATER ORTON, BiRMINGHAM, B46 1SH | 518189200070 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £2,600 | £2,800 |
| SP13 | 11, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1SP | 518189000112 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £4,900 | 65,900 |
| SP14 | 7, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, 84615 P | 518189000070 | SHOP AND PREMISES | ¢4,550 | £5,500 |
| SP15 | 9 9, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1SP | 518189000090 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £6,000 | £7,300 |
| SP16 | 1, STATION BUILDINGS, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGKAM, B4G 1SR | 518192100010 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £5,500 | £6,600 |
| SP17 | 1A, STATION BUILOINGS, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, $\qquad$ | 518192100012 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £3,000 | ¢3,600 |
| SP18 | 3, STATION BUILDINGS, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1SR | 518192100030 | SHOP AND PREMISES | ¢5,700 | £6,900 |
| SP19 | 4, STATION BUILOINGS, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, B46 158 | 518192100040 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £5,800 | £6,900 |
| SP20 | 6, STATION BUILDINGS, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1SR | 518192100060 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £5,800 | £6,900 |
| 5921 | 7, STATION BUILDINGS, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, | 518192100070 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £5,800 | £7,000 |
| SP22 | 8, STATION BUILDINGS, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1SR | 518192100086 | SHOP AND PREMISES |  | £19,000 |
| SP23 | 74, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 1TH | 518189000740 | SHOP ANO PREMISES | f1,700 | £1,775 |
| SP24 | 3, CHURCH HHL, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3AD | 511927800020 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £3,950 | ¢3,750 |
| SP25 | 77, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3AG | 511930100770 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £6,000 | £7,600 |
| SP26 | 79, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3AG | 511930100790 | SHOP AND PREMISES | ¢6,000 | £7,600 |
| SP27 | 87, HIGH STREET, COLESHIL, BIRMINGHAM, 846 3AG | 511930100870 | SHOP AND PREMISES | ¢8,200 | £7,800 |
| SP28 | 89 FRONT, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3AG | 13705023 | SHOP AND PREMISES |  | ¢2,175 |
| SP29 | 89 REAR, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 846 3AG | T3705024 | SHOP AND PREMISES |  | £ 3,400 |
| SP30 | 89A, HIGH STREET, COLESHHL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3AG | 511930100892 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £3,400 | £ 3,250 |
| SP31 | 91, HIGH STREET, COLESHHL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3AG | 511930100910 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £6,300 | £7,900 |
| SP32 | 95, HiGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3AG | 511930100950 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £2,750 | £3,500 |
| SP33 | 80, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3AH | 511930100801 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £8,100 | £7,700 |
| SP34 | 82, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3AH | 511930100820 | SHOP AND PREMISES | ¢7,000 | ¢6,700 |
| SP35 | 84-86, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 846 3AM | 511930100841 | SHOP AND PREMISES | € 36,250 | £ 32,000 |
| SP36 | 6, COVENTRY ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 84638 E | 511928400060 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £3,950 | £5,100 |
| SP37 | 8, COVENTRY ROAD, COLESHIL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 38E | 511928400082 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £3,950 | ¢5,100 |
| SP38. | 146, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BG | 511930101460 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £13,250 | £9,600 |
| Sp39. | 122, HIGH STREET, COLESHIL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BJ | 511930101220 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £6,400 | ¢8,100 |
| SP40. | 124, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, 81 MMINGHAM, B46 38J | 511930101240 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £3,800 | ¢ 4,850 |
| SP4t | 126, HIGH STREET, COLESHALL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3B] | 511930101261 | SHOP AND PREMISES |  | ¢3,500 |
| SP42 | 128, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BRRMINGHAM, 846 3BJ | 511930101285 | SHOP ANO PREMISES |  | £4,700 |
| $\mathrm{SP}^{\text {S } 46}$ | 100 , HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 38L | 511930101000 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £10,250 | £9,700 |
| SP47 | 106, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 38L | 511930101060 | SHOP AND PREMISES | f6,600 | ¢6,300 |
| Sp48 | 108, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BL | 511930100182 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £10,250 | ¢9,800 |
| SP49 | 110, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 8463 3BL | 511930101105 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £15,500 | £14,750 |
| Sp50 | 112A, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 846 3BL | 511930101120 | SHOP AND PREMISES | ¢6,800 | £6,400 |
| Sp, 51 | 88, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BL | 511930100881 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £7,000 | 66,700 |
| Sp, 2 | 92, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, 8IRMINGHAM, B46 38L | 511930100924 | SHOP AND PREMISES | ¢7,100 | ¢6,800 |
| Sp53. | 94, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 38L | 511930100940 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £8,600 | £8,200 |
| Sp54 | 96-98, HIGH STREET, COLESHALL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BL | 511930100980 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £8,500 | ¢8,000 |
| Sps5 | ADJ 112, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BL | 511930101121 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £4,950 | £4,700 |
| SP56 | GND FLR 112, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 38L | 511930101131 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £5,600 | £5,400 |
| Sp58. | 103, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3BP | 511930101031 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £11,500 | £14,750 |
| Sp59 | 109, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BiRMMNGHAM, B46 3BP | 519930101090 | SHOP AND PREMISES | € 5,800 | ¢ 4,850 |
| Sp60. | 115, HIGH STREET, COLESHLLL, BIRMINGHAM, 8463 3P | 511930101150 | SHOP AND PREMISES | ¢4,200 | ¢5,300 |
| SP61 | 117, HIGH STREET, COLESH:LL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 38P | 511930101170 | SHOP AND PREMISES | ¢6, 100 | £7,800 |
| SP64 | 2, CHAMBERLAIN WALK, HIGH STREET, COLESHHLL, BIRMINGHAM | 511927350020 | SHOP AND PREMISES |  | £3,550 |


| SP65 | 3-4, CHAMBERLAIN WALK, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511927350045 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £8,800 | £9,100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SP66 | 5.6, CHAMBERLAIN WALK, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511927350050 | SHOP AND PREMISES | 69,200 | £9,300 |
| SP67 | 7, CHAMBERLAIN WALK, HIGH STREET, COLESHHLL, BIRMINGHAM | 511927350070 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £4,400 | ¢4,500 |
| 5968 | 71, PARKFIELD ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511931700710 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £ 3,400 | ¢4,850 |
| SP69 | 73, PARKFIELD ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511931700730 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £3,400 | £4,950 |
| SP70 | 75, PARKFIELD ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511931700750 | SHOP AND PREMISES |  |  |
| SP71 | 77, PARKFIELD ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511931700770 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £4,050 | £5,800 |
| SP72 | 79, PARKFIELD ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511931700790 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £4,300 | £6,200 |
| SP73 | 10SA, WINGFIELD ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511934301054 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £3,050 | £ $£$, 600 |
| SP74 | 105C, WINGFIELD ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511934301050 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £4,400 | £4,950 |
| SP75 | UNIT 1, MIDDLETON HALL CRAFT CENTRE, MIDDLETON HALL, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872400073 | SHOP AND PREMISES |  | £1,100 |
| SP76 | UNIT 10 MIDDLETON HALL CRAFT CENTRE, MIDDLETON HALL, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872400086 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £1,500 | £1,700 |
| \$P81 | UNIT 2, MIDDLETON HALL CRAFT CENTRE, MIDDLETON HALL, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872400002 | SHOP AND PREMISES |  | $£ 600$ |
| SP82 | UNIT 3, MIDDLETON HALL CRAFT CENTRE, MIDDLETON HALL, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872400078 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £580 | £700 |
| SP83 | UNIT 7 MIDDLETON HALL CRAFY CENTRE, MHDDLETON HALL, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTM, STAFFS | 514872400082 | SHOP ANO PREMISES | £1,925 | £2,700 |
| SP84 | UNIT 8, MIDOLETON HALL CRAFT CENTRE, MIDDLETON HALL, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872400083 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £580 | $£ 690$ |
| SP85 | UNIT 9, MIODLETON HALL CRAFT CENTRE, MIDOLETON HALL, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872400085 | SHOP AND PREMISES | $£ 880$ | £1,000 |
| SP86 | ASH END HOUSE FARM, MIODLETON LANE, MIDOLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514870700031 | SHOP AND PREMISES | ¢9,900 | £12,250 |
| SP86 | 76.78, MILL CRESCENT, KINGSBURY, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514259100760 | SHOP AND PREMISES | ¢5,300 | ¢5,300 |
| SP87 | 84-86, HIGH STREET, COLESHLLL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3AH | 511930100841 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £32,500 | $¢ 32,000$ |
| SP90. | 114-116, HIGH STREET, COLESHIL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 38J | 5119301010160 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £16,250 | £15,500 |
| SP91 | 128A-128B, HIGH STREET, COLESHLLL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 381 | 511930101286 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £44,500 | £40,000 |
| SP92. | 111, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 846389 | 511930101110 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £4,200 | ¢5,300 |
| SP93 | 90, HIGH STREET, COLESHHLL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 3AH | 511930100902 | SHOPAND PREMISES | £3,450 | f.3,300 |
| SP59 | MIDOLETON VILLAGE STORES, CHURCH LANE, MIODLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS, B78 2AN | 514871100625 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £2,750 | £3,050 |
| SP89 | ALLENS OF KINGSBURY KINGSBURY MILL, COVENTRY ROAD, KINGSBURY, TAMWORTH, STAFFS, 8782 LN | 514257600921 | SHOP AND PREMISES | £9,100 | ¢9,900 |
| SP77 | UNIT 11, MIDDLETON HALL CRAFT CENTRE, MIDDLETON HALL, MIDOLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872400088 | SHOP AND PREMSIES | £650 | £730 |
| SP78 | UNIT 12, MIDOLETON HALL CRAFT CENTRE, MIDOLETON HALL, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872400089 | SHOP AND PREMSIES | £ 355 | $£ 465$ |
| SP79 | UNIT 13, MIDDLETON HALL CRAFT CENTRE, MIDDLETON HALL, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872400090 | SHOP AND PREMSIES | £355 | £465 |
| SP80 | UNI 14 MIDDIETON HALL CRAFT CENTRE, MIDDLETON HALL, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514872400091 | SHOP AND PREMSIES | £550 | £660 |
| SP88 | LITLE SHOPS 4 BIKERS BARCLAY HOUSE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS, 8769 9EE | 512237300440 | SHOP STORE AND PREMISES | £12,500 | £16,750 |
|  |  |  |  |  | ¢614,660 |
| SRP1 | 2, STATION BUILDINGS, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, B46 $15 R$ | 518192100020 | SHOWROOM AND PREMISES | £7,300 | £8,800 |
| RS1 | RONS CAFE, STONEBRIOGE ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B34 7SJ | 511933000970 | SITE FOR REFRESHMENT STALL | £ 850 | £760 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ATM1 | ATM STTE AT GRIMSTOCK HLLL SERVICE STATION, LICHFIELD ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, BA6 1 LD | 511929600018 | STTE OF ATM |  | £3,750 |
| LC1 | COLESHILL LEISURE CENTRE, PARK ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511931600050 | SPORTS CENTRE AND PREMISES | £46,000 | £56,000 |
| S62 | LeA MARSTON SPORTING CLUB, BLACKGREAVES LANE, LEA MARSTON, SUTTON COLDFELD. WEST MIDLANDS | 514563700071 | SPORTS GROUND AND PREMISES | £810 | ¢1,050 |
| 563 | SPORTSGROUND, COTON ROAD, NETHER WHITACRE, BIRMINGHAM, BA6 $2 E X$ | 518393600010 | SPORTS GROUND AND PREMISES | £1,700 | $£ 1,825$ |
| SG4 | SPORTSGROUND, COPPICE LANE, MIDOLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS, B78 2 2BI | 514871300280 | SPORTS GROUND AND PREMISES | £9,500 | £9,500 |
|  |  |  |  |  | £68,375 |
| STBI | CROWBERRY STABLES, CROWBERRY LANE, MIDDIETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514871401000 | STABLES \& PREMISES | E5,200 | £6,200 |
| 5782 | HORSESHOES STABLES, CROWBERRY LANE, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514871400041 | STABLES AND PREMISES |  | £2,075 |
| STB3 | WLLLOWS STABLES, CROWBERRY LANE, MIDDLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS | 514871400028 | STABLES AND PREMISES | £1,650 | £2,475 |
| 5784 | WATER ORTON STABLESAT THE MOUNT, COLESHILL ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS, 8769 HP | 512236801220 | STABLES AND PREMISES | £3,350 | £4,900 |
|  |  |  |  |  | £15,650 |
| S02 | HIGRWAYS AGENCY AT HIGHWAYS DEPOT, COLESHILL HEATH ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511928200427 | STORAGE DEPOT ANO PREMISES | £60,500 | £57,500 |
| SD3 | WCC AT HIGHWAYS DEPOT, COLESHILL HEATH ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511928200428 | STORAGE OEPOT AND PREMISES | £65,000 | ¢66,500 |
|  |  |  |  |  | £124,000 |
| STP22 | STORE(PETER MITCHELL) ADI MIDDLETON HOUSE FARM, TAMWORTH ROAD, MIODLETON, TAMWORTH, STAFFS, B78 2BD | 514872500050 | STORE | £1,450 | £1,450 |
| STP1 | ICT EXPRESS LTD, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 1HT | 511932910895 | STORE AND PREMISES | £ $£ 24,250$ | ¢ 25,250 |
| STP2 | PART UNIT 20A \& 20B, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 $13 T$ | 511932910201 | STORE AND PREMISES |  | £19,250 |
| STP3 | STORE AT PLAYING FIELDS, OPENFIELO CROFT, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, BA6 IRE | 518189201561 | STORE AND PREMISES |  | £1,800 |





| NO | 4-5, THE CEDARS, COTON ROAD, NETHER WHITACRE, BIRMINGHAM, B46 2 HH | 518393600955 | WAREHOUSE, OFFICE AND PREMISES | £37,750 | £41,250 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W40 | 27, ROMAN WAY, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1HO | 511932300277 | WAREHOUSE/OFFICES AND PREMISES |  | £132,000 |
| WST1 | UNIT 4, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1HT | 511939100007 | WAREHOUSE/STORAGE AND PREMISES |  | f11,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | £17,583,750 |
| WE81 | AT RYE FARM, RYEFIELD LANE, WISHAW, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 518797700001 | WEIGHBRIDGE AND PREMISES | £900 | ¢740 |
| WKR1 | SECOND FLOOR 118, HIGH STREET, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 38J | 511930101181 | WORKROOMS | £2,300 | £2,500 |
| WS1 | THE ARMOURY, COLESHILL MANOR, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 10 L | 511926500230 | WORKSHOP ANO PREMISES | £15,750 | $£ 16,250$ |
| WS2 | R/O HALLMARK CARS, LICHFIELD ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 EQ | 511930700882 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £1,150 | £1,400 |
| WS 3 | UNIT 11, ROMAN WAY, COLESHHL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1HG | 511932300111 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | ¢45,750 | £49,250 |
| WS4 | UNIT 12, ROMAN WAY, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1HG | 511932300121 | WORKSHOP ANO PREMISES | £47,000 | ¢47,750 |
| WS5 | UNIT 7, ROMAN WAY, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1HG | 511932300075 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £36,750 | £ 35,250 |
| WS6 | UNITS 21-22, ROMAN WAY, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 846 1HG | 511932300212 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £51,500 | £55,000 |
| wS7 | I ROB UK LTD UNITS $1 \& 2$, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 HT | 511932910046 | WORKSHOP ANO PREMESES | £10,500 | £11,000 |
| WS8 | 1ST FLR UNIT 3 \& 4 R/O INTERLINK DESIGN \& DISPLAYITD, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 HT | 511932910242 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £4,750 | £4,950 |
| W59 | COLESHILL FREIGHT SERVICES LTD, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, $\mathrm{B46} 1 \mathrm{HT}$ | 511932910894 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £49,750 | £51,500 |
| WS10 | GND FLR UNIT 3 R/O INTERLINK DESIGN \& DISPLAY LTD, STATION ROAD, COLESHIL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 HT | 511932910241 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £14,250 | £13,750 |
| WS11 | INTERLINK DESIGN \& DISPLAY LTT UNITS 1-2, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, BA6 \&HT | 511932910236 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £ 34,500 | £38,000 |
| WS10 | OAKLANDS PLASTICS LTD, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 2 HT | 511932910250 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £63,500 | £59,500 |
| WS13 | UNIT 1 AT 25, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 HT | 511932910045 | WORKSHOP ANO PREMISES | £10,750 | £10,500 |
| WS14 | UNIT 14, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1HT | 511932910008 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £21,250 | £22,250 |
| WS16 | UNITS \& \& 9, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1HT | 511932910108 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £72,500 | £78,000 |
| WS17 | WORKSHOP ADJ BMTR LTD, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 $1 \mathrm{HT}$ | 511932910005 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £50,500 |
| WS18 | UNIT 20, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 IG | 511932910128 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £48,250 |
| WS19 | UNITS 20C \& 200, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 IG | 511932910189 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £24,250 |
| WS20 | UNIT 21, COLESHILLINDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGMAM, B46 1 , | 511932910211 | WORKSHOP ANO PREMISES |  | £16,000 |
| WS21 | UNIT 22, COLESHILL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 846 2JP | 51932910213 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £16,000 |
| WS22 | UNIT 24, COLESHILL INOUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 IJP | 511932920240 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £15,000 |
| WS23 | UNIT 26, COLESHLL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHHLL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1JP | 511932920260 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £14,250 |
| WS24 | UNIT 27, COLESHILL INOUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, BAG 1JP | 511932920271 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £15,750 |
| WS25 | UNIT 47 \& PTUNIT 48, COLESHHLL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHLL, BIRMINGHAM, 846 1JP | 511932920470 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | $£ 20,750$ |
| WS26 | R/O NO 4 WORKS, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 130 | 511932901101 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £21,500 |
| WS27 | UNIT 41, COLESHILLINDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 IJF | 511932920410 | WORKSHOP ANO PREMISES |  | £15,250 |
| WS28 | UNT 40, COLESHILL INOUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 11T | 511932920401 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £15,500 |
| WS29 | UNIT 43, COLESHIL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1JT | 512932920432 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £15,500 |
| WS30 | UNIT 44, COLESHILL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, 846 1JT | 511932920441 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £15,250 |
| WS31 | UNIT 45, COLESHILLINDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1JT | 511932920459 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £16,250 |
| WS32 | UNIT S2, COLESHILL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 IT | 511932920535 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £15,750 |
| WS33 | UNIT 53, COLESHILL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, BA6 IT | 511932920536 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £ 15,750 |
| WS34 | UNIT 54, COLESHILL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHALL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 IJT | 511932920537 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £15,750 |
| WS35 | UNITS 49 \& 50, COLESHILL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 $11 T$ | 511932920492 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £ 30,750 |
| WS36 | UNITS 57-S9, COLESHILL INOUSTRIAL ESTATE, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 13T | 511932920573 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £43,000 |
| W537 | UNIT 1, GUILD WORKS, GORSEY LANE, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1 U | 511929300302 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £10,750 |
| WS38 | UNIT 2, GUILD WORKS, GORSEY LANE, COLESHILL, $81 \mathrm{RMINGHAM}, \mathrm{B46} 114$ | 511929300302 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £10,000 |
| WS39 | UNITS A \& \& C, LAKESIDE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, MARSH LANE, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, B46 INS | 518190600441 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £132,000 | £150,000 |
| W540 | UNIT 2, JACK O WATTON BUSANESS PARK, LICHFIELD ROAD, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, B46 INU | 518190100021 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | ¢17,250 |
| WS41 | 452 MOTOR COMPANY LTD, MARSH LANE, WATER ORTON, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1NW | 518190600683 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £ 13,750 | £13,250 |


| WS42 | E-ON POWER ENGINEERING SERVICES, HAMS HALL INDUSTRIAL PARK, FARADAY AVENUE, COLESHIL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 1PW | 514564160022 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £228,000 | £232,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NO | WORKSHOP AT YEW TREE HOUSE 114-116, BIRMINGHAM ROAD, NETHER WHITACRE, BIRMINGHAM, 846 2EP | 518393201144 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES |  | £7,100 |
| NO | UNIT AT 3 YEW TREE COTTAGE, COTON ROAD, NETHER WHITACRE, BIRMINGHAM, B45 2 HD | 518393600861 | WORKSHOP ANO PREMISES |  | £2,800 |
| WS43 | R/O 21, COVENTRY ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM | 511928400213 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £7,400 | £13,000 |
| W558 | UNIT 4, WOOOHOUSE FARM, CHURCH LANE, LEA MARSTON, SUTTON COLDFFELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 514563900040 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £1,625 | £1,600 |
| W559 | UNIT 5A, WOODHOUSE FARM, CHURCH LANE, LEA MARSTON, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 514563900051 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £1,925 | £1,975 |
| W560 | UNIT SB, WOODHOUSE FARM, CHURCH LANE, LEA MARSTON, SUTTON COLDFIEED, WEST MIDIANDS | 514563900052 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £2,300 | £2,550 |
| W561 | UNIT 6, WOOOHOUSE FARM, CHURCH LANE, LEA MARSTON, SUTTON COLDFFLLO, WEST MIDLANDS | 514563900060 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £3,950 | £3,900 |
| WS62 | UNIT 7A, WOODHOUSE FARM, CHURCH LANE, LEA MARSTON, SUTTON COLDFEELD, WEST MIDLANOS | 514563900071 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £1,550 | £1,575 |
| W563 | UNIT 7B, WOODHOUSE FARM, CHURCH LANE, LEA MARSTON, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 514563900072 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £1,900 | £1,925 |
| WS64 | THE COACH HOUSE AT DUNTON COPPICE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANOS | 512237300542 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £3,850 | £4,350 |
| W565 | RESROC LTO AT MULLENSGROVE FARM, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLOFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300389 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £2,550 | ¢2,550 |
| WS66 | UNIT IOA MULLENSGROVE FARM, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300380 | WORKSHOP ANO PREMISES | E860 | $£ 910$ |
| W567 | UNIT 13B, MULLENSGROVE FARM, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTJON COLDFELD, WEST MIDLANOS | 512237300443 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £2,800 | £2,950 |
| WS68 | UNIT 2 MULLENSGROVE FARM, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300102 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £1,475 | £1,600 |
| WS72 | UNIT C, DUNTON PARK, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFFLD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300657 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £63,500 | £79,500 |
| WS73 | PART UNIT 1A, FAIRVIEW INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300585 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £7,700 | £8,500 |
| WS74 | THE OLD CHAPEL, BODYMOOR HEATH LANE, BODYMOOR HEATH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 514870800031 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £1,575 | £1,300 |
| WS75 | BUMBLE ENO BARN, GROVE LANE, WISHAW, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 518797400000 | WORKSHOP ANO PREMISES | £1,325 | £1,250 |
| WS76 | T.B.T.U.K.LTD, GORSEY LANE, COLESHHL, BIRMINGGAM, B4S 11U | 511929300056 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £54,500 | ¢49,250 |
| WS77 | UNIT GA KINGSBURY ROAD \& UNIT 1 A PT UNITS $2 \cdot 3$ UNIT 4 \& PT UNIT 5 , FAIRVIEW INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANOS, B76 9EE | 512237300651 | WORKSHOP ANO PREMISES | £257,500 | £290,000 |
| WS78 | UNIT 5 MULLENSGROVE FARM, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS, B76 ODF COLDFIEED, WEST MIDLANDS, 876 ODF | 512237301400 | WORKSHOP AND PREMMSES | £1,475 | £1,775 |
| WS79 | UNIT 8 MULLENSG ROVE FARM, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS, B76 ODF | 512237301480 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £3,700 | £3,950 |
| W580 | UNITS 3-4 MULLENSGROVE FARM, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS, B760DF | 512237301434 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £2,650 | £3,150 |
| W581 | UNIT C, DUNTON PARK, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS, 876 SEE | 512237300657 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | £63,500 | £79,500 |
| SP88 | WORKSHOP AT HOME FARM, KINGSBURY ROAD, MARSTON, SUTTON COLDFELD, WEST MIOLANDS, B76 OOP | 514564400130 | WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | E3,600 | £3,400 |
| WS44 | UNIT 1, NEWLANDS FARM, NEWLANDS LANE, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS, 876 OBE | 512237800012 | WORKSHOP AND PREMSIES |  | £1,100 |
| WS45 | UNIT 1O, NEWLANDS FARM, NEWLANDS LANE, CUROWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237800100 | WORKSHOP AND PREMSIES |  | £6,200 |
| WS46 | UNIT 11, NEWLANDS FARM, NEW LANDS LANE, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLOFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237800110 | WORKSHOP AND PREMSIES |  | ¢5,900 |
| W547 | UNIT 1A, NEWLANOS FARM, NEWLANDS LANE, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237800013 | WORKSHOP AND PREMSIES |  | £1,100 |
| WS48 | UNIT 1B, NEWLANDS FARM, NEWLANDS LANE, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237800014 | WORKSHOP AND PREMSIES |  | £1,125 |
| WS49 | UNIT 2, NEWLANDS FARM, NEWLANDS LANE, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237800021 | WORKSHOP ANO PREMSIES |  | £1,900 |
| Wsso | UNIT 3, NEWLANDS FARM, NEWLANDS LANE, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFFELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237800030 | WORKSHOP AND PREMSIES |  | £1,000 |
| WS51 | UNIT A, NEWLANDS FARM, NEWLANDS LANE, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237800040 | WORKSHOP AND PREMSIES |  | £1,000 |
| WS52 | UNIT S, NEWLANOS FARM, NEWLANDS LANE, CUROWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237800050 | WORKSHOP AND PREMSIES |  | £1,000 |
| WS53 | UNIT 6 , NEWLANOS FARM, NEWLANDS LANE, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237800060 | WORKSHOP AND PREMSIES |  | £1,275 |
| WSS4 | UNIT 7, NEWLANDS FARM, NEWLANDS LANE, CUROWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237800070 | WORKSHOP AND PREMSIES |  | ¢4,100 |
| WS55 | UNIT 8, NEWLANDS FARM, NEWIANDS LANE, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANOS | 512237800080 | WORKSHOP AND PREMSIES |  | £2,150 |
| WS5s | UNIT 9, NEWLANDS FARM, NEWLANDS LANE, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237800090 | WORKSHOP AND PREMSIES |  | £1,900 |
| WS57 | YARD AT, NEWLANOS FARM, NEWLANDS LANE, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANOS | 512237800120 | WORKSHOP AND PREMSIES |  | £8,300 |
| W569 | PART UNIT 1A, FAIRVIEW INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTTON COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300584 | WORKSHOP AND PREMSIES | £6,700 | £7,100 |
| W570 | PART UNIT 1A, FAIRVIEW INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, KINGSBURY ROAD, CURDWORTH, SUTION COLDFIELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300583 | WORKSHOP AND PREMSIES | ¢4,450 | £5,100 |


| WS71 | UNIT 2 WARWICK HOUSE, FAIRVIEW INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, KINGSBURY ROAD, <br> CUROWORTH, SUTON COLDFFELD, WEST MIDLANDS | 512237300563 | WORKSHOP ANO PREMSIES |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WSO1 | NO 4 WORKS, STATION ROAD, COLESHILL, BIRMINGHAM, B46 110 | 51.932901100 | WORKSHOP, OFFICE AND PREMISES |  |  |
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| 5 | School and Prem | $£ 420,000$ |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | Scout Hall | $£ 2,150$ |
| 1 | SEMI-AUTOMATIC METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVING SYSTEM | $£ 3,000$ |
| 4 | Sewage Treatment Works | $£ 948,150$ |
| 89 | Shop and Premises | $£ 614,660$ |
| 1 | Showroom | $£ 8,800$ |
| 1 | Site for Refreshment | $£ 760$ |
| 1 | Site of ATM | $£ 3,750$ |
| 4 | Sports Centre/Ground | $£ 68,375$ |
| 4 | Stables | $£ 15,650$ |
| 2 | Storage Depot | $£ 142,000$ |
| 26 | Stores | $£ 229,000$ |
| 1 | Supermarket | $£ 78,550$ |
| 5 | Surgery | $£ 17,500$ |
| 1 | Swimming Pool | $£ 6,000$ |
| 1 | Tennis Club | $£ 647,900$ |
| 2 | Tipping Site | $£ 13,250$ |
| 1 | Town Hall and Prem | $£ 21,250$ |
| 1 | Tyre Exhaust | $£ 175,875$ |
| 10 | Vehicle Repair Depot | $£ 21,523,750$ |
| 87 | Warehouse and Prem | $£ 740$ |
| 1 | Weighbridge and premises | $£ 2,500$ |
| 1 | Workrooms | $£ 2,278,375$ |
| 67 | Workshop and Premises | $£ 46,666,595$ |
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| OFFICES |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| OFFICES | 220 | $£ 4,240,775$ |
| Town Hall and Prem | 1 | $£ 13,250$ |
|  | 221 | $£ 4,254,025$ |


| RETAIL |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| SHOP AND PREMSIES | 89 | $£ 614,660$ |  |
| BANK AND PREMISES | 3 | $£ 55,750$ |  |
| BETTING SHOP AND PREMISES | 1 | $£ 5,500$ |  |
| CAFE AND PREMISES | 4 | $£ 28,150$ |  |
| CAR SALES AREA, OFFICE \& PREMISES | 1 | $£ 9,800$ |  |
| GARDEN CENTRE | 1 | $£ 40,000$ |  |
| HAIRDRESSING SALON AND PREMSIES | 5 | $£ 25,280$ |  |
| LAUNDERETTE AND PREMISES | 1 | $£ 5,300$ |  |
| POST OFFICE AND PREMISES | 2 | $£ 4,650$ |  |
| PUBLIC HOUSE AND PREMISES | 17 | $£ 1,102,000$ |  |
| RESTAURANT AND PREMISES | 7 | $£ 70,600$ |  |
| SITE FOR REFRESHMENT STALL | 1 | $£ 760$ |  |
| SUPERMARKET AND PREMISES | 1 | $£ 229,000$ |  |
|  |  | 133 |  |


| INDUSTRIAL |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| FACTORY AND PREMISES | 11 | $£ 1,132,000$ |
| GARAGE AND PREMISES | 2 | $£ 33,000$ |
| STORES, OFFICES AND PREMISES | 24 | $£ 97,835$ |
| VEHICLE DEPOT AND PREMISES | 8 | $£ 101,875$ |
| WAREHOUSE AND PREMISES | 16 | $£ 798,900$ |
| WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | 28 | $£ 1,073,575$ |
| WORKROOMS | 1 | $£ 2,500$ |
| WEIGH BBRIDGE | 1 | $£ 740$ |
|  | 91 | $£ 3,240,425$ |


| INDUSTRIAL 2 - Coleshill \& Hams Hall Industrial Park |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| COLD STORE AND PREMISES | 2 | $£ 1,860,000$ |
| FACTORY AND PREMISES | 29 | $£ 5,384,800$ |
| FREIGHT TERMINAL AND PREMISES | 1 | $£ 125,000$ |
| ROAD HAULAGE DEPOT, OFFICE AND PREMISES | 1 | $£ 40,750$ |
| STORAGE DEPOT AND PREMISES | 2 | $£ 124,000$ |
| STORES, OFFICES AND PREMISES | 2 | $£ 44,500$ |
| TYRE AND EXHAUST CENTRE AND PREMISES | $\mathbf{2}$ | $£ 21,250$ |
| VEHICLE DEPOT AND PREMISES | 1 | $£ 74,000$ |


| WAREHOUSE AND PREMISES | 71 | $£ 20,724,850$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | 39 | $£ 1,204,800$ |
|  | 150 | $£ 29,603,950$ |


| MISC |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CAR PARK AND PREMISES | 4 | £14,100 |
| CATTERY | 3 | £1,705 |
| CEMETERY AND PREMISES | 2 | £38,950 |
| CLUB AND PREMISES | 4 | £49,350 |
| COMMUNICATION STATION AND PREMISES | 22 | £153,000 |
| COMMUNITY CENTRE | 3 | £18,200 |
| CONCRETE | 4 | £431,250 |
| ELECTRICITY GENERATING PLANT AND PREMISES | 1 | $£ 212,000$ |
| HAND CAR WASH \& PREMISES | 2 | £18,600 |
| HISTORIC BUILDING | 1 | $£ 4,500$ |
| KENNELS CATTERY AND PREMISES | 2 | $£ 3,290$ |
| LIVERY STABLES AND PREMISES | 1 | £4,350 |
| LAND USED FOR STORAGE AND PREMISES | 5 | £630,100 |
| PETROL FILLING STATION AND PREMISES | 1 | £26,250 |
| PIPELINE \& APPURTENANCES | 1 | £5,600 |
| POLICE STATION AND PREMISES | 1 | £82,000 |
| PUBLIC CONVENIENCE | 2 | $£ 3,375$ |
| QUARRY AND PREMISES | 1 | £39,750 |
| SEMI-AUTOMATIC METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVING SYSTEM | 1 | $£ 3,000$ |
| SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS AND PREMISES | 4 | £948,150 |
| FIRE STATION AND PREMISES | 1 | $£ 51,000$ |
| SCOUT HALL | 1 | £2,150 |
| SHOWROOM | 1 | £8,800 |
| SITE OF ATM | 1 | $£ 3,750$ |
| TIPPING SITE AND PREMISES | 2 | £647,900 |
|  | 71 | £3,401,120 |


| LEISURE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CAMPING SITE AND PREMISES | 3 | £70,875 |
| CRICKET GROUND AND PREMISES | 2 | £10,700 |
| FOOTBALL GROUND AND PREMISES | 1 | £3,400 |
| GOLF COURSE AND PREMISES | 1 | £87,500 |
| GUEST HOUSE AND PREMISES | 6 | £32,250 |
| HALL AND PREMISES | 9 | £46,025 |
| HOTEL AND PREMISES | 5 | £2,943,000 |
| RIDING SCHOOL AND PREMISES | 3 | $£ 27,650$ |
| RUGBY GROUND AND PREMISES | 1 | £10,000 |
| SAILING CLUB AND PREMISES | 2 | £15,600 |
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| SPORTS CENTRE AND PREMISES | 4 | $£ 68,375$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| STABLES \& PREMISES | 4 | $£ 15,650$ |
| SWIMMING POOL AND PREMISES | 1 | $£ 17,500$ |
| TENNIS CLUB AND PREMISES | 1 | $£ 6,000$ |
|  | 43 | $£ 3,354,525$ |


| NON - RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTIONS |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| HEALTH CARE AND PREMISES | 3 | 25250 |
| LIBRARY AND PREMISES | 3 | 39750 |
| DAY NURSERY AND PREMISES | 5 | 57550 |
| SCHOOL. AND PREMISES | 5 | $£ 420,000$ |
| SURGERY AND PREMISES | 5 | $£ 78,550$ |
|  | 21 | $£ 621,100$ |


| DELETED PROPERTY |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| COMMUNICATION STATION AND PREMISES | 5 | $£ 17,740$ |
| GARDEN CENTRE AND PREMISES | 1 | $£ 420,000$ |
| GUEST HOUSE AND PREMISES | 2 | $£ 14,900$ |
| LAND USED FOR STORAGE AND PREMISES | 1 | $£ 8,300$ |
| OFFICES AND PREMISES | 18 | $£ 1,027,550$ |
| RIDING SCHOOL AND PREMISE | 1 | $£ 5,000$ |
| SPORTS GROUND AND PREMISE | 1 | $£ 375,000$ |
| STABLES AND PREMISES | 1 | $£ 6,700$ |
| STORE AND PREMISE | 10 | $£ 42,075$ |
| SURGERY AND PREMISES | 1 | $£ 3,650$ |
| WAREHOUSE AND PREMISE | $£ 2$ | $£ 709,250$ |
| WORKSHOP AND PREMISES | 21 | $£ 53,435$ |
| SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS | 2 | $£ 453,000$ |
|  | 66 | $£ 3,136,600$ |






Mr Steve Maxey
Assistant Chief Executive
North Warwickshire Borough Council
The Council House,
South Street,
Atherstone,
Warwickshire,
CV ${ }_{11} \mathrm{DE}$
$27^{\text {th }}$ October 2014
By email and by post

Dear Mr Maxey,

## Assurances Relating to High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

I am the Director of Hybrid Bill Delivery at HS2 Ltd, which is acting on behalf of the Promoter of the High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill ('the Bill') currently before Parliament. I am writing to you on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport to set out the assurances that the Secretary of State is willing to give in order to address North Warwickshire Borough Council's (the Council) concerns regarding the impact of Phase One of HS2 (known as 'the Proposed Scheme'). The detail of each assurance is set out below in the following order:

- Special Management Zone,
- Kingsbury Road Railhead environmental mitigation, and
- Improved Public Access.

Please would you kindly confirm that the detailed wording below is acceptable and that, on the basis of these assurances, the Council will only be appearing in Select Committee on the matter of Business Rates Relief. This does not prevent the Council from appearing in support of other petitioners or petitioning the House of Lords if it considers it necessary. These assurances will be included in the Register of Undertakings and Assurances maintained by the Secretary of State.

## DETAILED ASSURANCES:

In these assurances, the Nominated Undertaker means the relevant nominated undertaker appointed under the Bill as enacted and, in the period prior to the Secretary of State appointing a nominated undertaker and imposing the requirements on it referred to in these assurances, HS 2 Ltd .
"HS2 Works" means works to be authorised by the Bill.

1. SPECIAL MANAGEMENT ZONE

In line with the Code of Construction Practice, the Secretary of State will require the nominated
High Speed Two (HS2) Limited Sanctuary Buildings, 20-22 Great 5mith Street, London SW P P 3 BT
T: 02079444908 E: hszenquiries@hsz.org.uk www.hsz.org.uk
Hiah Speed Two (HS2) Limited, registered in England and Wales.
P1758 (1) stered office: One Canada Square, London E145AB. Company registration number: o6791686. VAT registration number: 181431230 .
undertaker to ensure that appropriately experienced community engagement personnel are appointed to manage stakeholder and community relationships during the development of $\mathrm{HS}_{2}$ in North Warwickshire.

The community engagement team will include:

- A single point of contact for local authorities in the area;
- Named individual points of contact for affected property owners; and
- A senior manager accountable for effective implementation of the Code of Construction Practice in the North Warwickshire area.

The broad duties of individuals will include, but will not be limited to:

- Being the first point of contact for communities and local authorities along the line of route;
- Coordination between both proposed phases of the railway, including alignment of powers and construction approaches;
- Managing relationships with the local communities, businesses, local authorities and other stakeholders;
- Raising issues from the community within $\mathrm{HS}_{2}$ Ltd for escalation, resolution or clarification;
- Monitoring the progress of each item raised and keeping stakeholders informed of progress;
- Ensuring the HS2 stakeholder engagement framework is appropriately implemented; for the whole scheme
- Attending regular meetings with the lead contractor, local authority, local community and other stakeholders to discuss construction issues and forthcoming programmes of works; and
- Advising on the appropriate support mechanisms to be provided by the nominated undertaker which will be available to local businesses, land owners, voluntary and community organisations that may be affected by the works.


## 2. KINGSBURY ROAD RAILHEAD ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION

The Secretary of State will require the Nominated Undertaker to develop an enhanced scheme of landscape planting and earthwork bunding adjacent to the Kingsbury Road railhead additional to that proposed in the Environmental Statement (the Kingsbury Road Railhead Environmental Mitigation Scheme) to be broadly in line with that shown on the attached indicative drawing no : $\mathrm{C}_{2} 23$-HS2-DS-SKE-$030-002475$ but which may be subject to design refinement as more detailed designs for the HS2 Works are brought forward and including -

1 Landscape planting and additional earthworks to the south east of the site Area A
2 Landscape planting and additional earthworks to the north of the site on each side of the headshunt and proposed balancing pond Area B
3 Landscape planting between Kingsbury Road and the site Area C
The Secretary of State will require the nominated undertaker to implement the works in accordance with the the Kingsbury Road Railhead Environmental Mitigation Scheme.

In preparing the Kingsbury Road Railhead Environmental Mitigation Scheme the Nominated Undertaker will keep North Warwickshire Borough Council informed of progress and any material changes to the design.

## 3. IMPROVED PUBLIC ACCESS.

3.1 Review of cycle access to Birmingham Interchange Station

The Secretary of State will require the Nominated Undertaker to undertake a review of cycle access from Coleshill to the Birmingham Interchange Station during the detailed design phase and to take all reasonably practicable steps to implement the findings of such review within the powers and limits and available budget of the Bill.
3.2 Public Rights of Way

### 3.2.1 T17

The Secretary of State will require the Nominated Undertaker to promote, and subject to the approval of Parliament, will require the Nominated Undertaker to provide an alternative alignment for footpath $\mathrm{T}_{17} 7$. Such alternative alignment will be broadly in the form shown on the indicative drawing numbered C223-CSI-CV-SKE-030-000061 PO2, but may be subject to design refinement as more detailed designs for the $\mathrm{HS}_{2}$ Works are brought forward.

### 3.2.2 M23

The Secretary of State will require the Nominated Undertaker to provide an alternative route for footpath $\mathrm{M}_{23}$ around the proposed Kingsbury railhead. Such alternative route is to be broadly in the form shown on the indicative drawing labelled FIRST PASS CHANGE HST-RST-251B, but may be subject to design refinement as detailed designs for the $\mathrm{HS}_{2}$ Works are brought forward.

### 3.2.3 M2za Seeney Lane Bridleway

The Secretary of State will ensure that the Nominated Undertaker does not alter the status of bridleway M23a at Seeney Lane so as to create a Byway Open to All Traffic at this location.

## 4. BODYMOOR HEATH ROAD

The Secretary of State will require the Nominated Undertaker to undertake a review of traffic at Bodymoor Heath Road where it crosses the Birminham and Fazeley canal to investigate the potential benefits of implementing traffic calming measures at this location. This review will be carried out in consultation with the Highways Authority, and undertaken during the detailed design phase of the project.

In addition to discussions relating to the above assurances, it should be noted that the Department for Transport has made an announcement regarding options for a community and business fund. It will be open to the community at Middleton to apply to this fund in relation to the proposed Heritage Trail.

In addition, I can confirm that discussions are continuing with The Old Saltleians Rugby Club with a view to reaching an agreement such that the club can continue to complete their fixtures in the area. A solution is also being sought in respect of the future of the properties situated between Kingsbury Road and the Railhead.

In response to your concern about the loss of environmental mitigation already put in place at the site of the proposed Kingsbury Railhead ( for the purposes of mitigating the development of the Hams Hall Business and Distribution Park) I can confirm that the further environmental mitigation proposed to be implemented in both this area ( at Kingsbury) and in the Faraday Avenue area in connection with the HS2 scheme will compensate for the losses at the railhead itself.

There was another matter that you raised in connection with the Kingsbury Railhead. The Railhead will be sited on Green Belt land and will be required for the project for a number of years. The Bill would confer powers of outright acquisition of the land concerned. You have sought comfort that, ultimately, when the land is no longer required for $\mathrm{HS}_{2}$ it will be restored as if it had been acquired only temporarily. The position is covered by the Bill. Paragraph 12 of Schedule 16 provides the framework that will apply to the Railhead. It provides for the restoration of sites once their use for carrying out operations ancillary to the construction of any of the scheduled works is discontinued and requires such sites to be restored in accordance with a scheme agreed with the relevant planning authority (or determined by appropriate Ministers in the absence of agreement). It follows that the railhead site will be treated for the purposes of paragraph 12 of Schedule 16 to the Bill as a site for carrying out operations ancillary to the construction of the scheduled works.

HS2 Ltd will also continue to work with North Warwickshire Borough Council in addressing the assurances outlined above and in resolving other matters contained within its petition with a view to avoiding the need for the Council to petition against the Bill in the House of Lords and against the additional provisions brought forward.

I trust that the above assurances accurately reflect the outcome of recent discussions. I am copying this letter to Alastair Lewis of Sharpe Pritchard, who I understand are your appointed parliamentary agents and Michael Summerfield (HS2 Ltd).


Director, Hybrid Bill Delivery
High Speed Two (HS2) Limited

Enc.
Plan No. C223-HS2-DS-SKE-030-002475-Environmental Mitigation Plan No. C223-CSI-CV-SKE-030-000061 PO2 Indicative drawing labelled FIRST PASS CHANGE HST-RST-251B Plan No. C224-ARP-HW-DSK-040-000001-RST00002756

Ms D. Barratt
North Warwickshire Borough Council
The Council House,
South Street,
Atherstone,
Warwickshire,
CV9 1DE

2 December 2015

By email only.
Dear Ms Barratt

## Assurances Relating to High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill - Petition Number AP2:146

I am the Director of Hybrid Bill Delivery at HS2 Ltd, which is acting on behalf of the Promoter of the High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill ('the Bill') currently before Parliament. I am writing to you on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport to set out the assurances that the Secretary of State is willing to give in order to address some of North Warwickshire Borough Council's concerns regarding the impact of Phase One of HS2 (known as 'the Proposed Scheme').

## DETAILED ASSURANCES:

In these assurances unless the context otherwise requires, the following expressions shall have the following meanings:


T:02079444908 E:hszenquiries@hsz.org.uk www.hsz.org.uk
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Promoter

Proposed Scheme

Secretary of State appointing a nominated undertaker and imposing the requirements on it referred to in these assurances, $\mathrm{HS}_{2} \mathrm{Ltd}$;
means the Secretary of State for Transport or any successor Secretary of State or Minister holding the Transport portfolio and includes so far as relevant any Nominated Undertaker exercising the powers or functions under the Bill;
means Phase 1 of $\mathrm{HS}_{2}$ as described in the Bill.

## Faraday Avenue/Hams Hall Business Park

At paragraph 8 of the Council's petition, the Council states that:
"Your Petitioners also wish to ensure that all companies on the Hams Hall industrial estate continue to enjoy uninterrupted access to and egress from the highway 24 hours a day 7 days a week."

As explained by the Promoter at a meeting with the Council on 22 October 2015, the temporary diversion of Faraday Avenue was amended through Additional Provision 2 to reflect discussions the Promoter has had with businesses located within Hams Hall Business Park including BMW and Sainsbury's. As set out in the AP2 ES para 5.1.2:
"Since submission of the Bill, it was identified that businesses along Faraday Avenue rely on the dual two-lane carriageway as their sole commercial access (see map CT-05-112b, grid reference E6 in the SES and AP2 ES Volume 2, CFA20 Map Book). Through discussions with Warwickshire County Council and a number of major companies in the business park, it was determined that the temporary arrangement described in the main ES would not provide the desired resilience. An alternative temporary diversion was designed which will connect into the existing roundabout with the A446 Lichfield Road rather than the temporary $T$-junction, maintaining a minimum of three lanes over two carriageways at all times. Where possible all four lanes will remain open with the use of traffic management."

As such it is considered that this matter has now been addressed to the satisfaction of the affected petitioners. The Promoter is however sensitive to the Council's concerns regarding the impact of the works to Faraday Avenue on Hams Hall Business Park. As such, the Promoter is prepared to offer the Council the following assurance to address these concerns:

## 1. Hams Hall Working Group

The Promoter shall engage with North Warwickshire Borough Council and other businesses based at the Hams Hall business park in order to establish a Hams Hall Working Group with a remit to consult and liaise with one another on a regular basis to:
(i) facilitate use of and access to the Hams Hall distribution park during the construction phase of the Proposed Scheme; and
(ii) protect the interests of the businesses based at Hams Hall distribution park generally during the construction of the Relevant Works.

At the meeting of 22 October 2015, the Council also expressed concern about the steepness of the embankment to be constructed adjacent to the proposed diversion of Faraday Avenue and specifically whether this would be in place at the same point as the temporary diversion. In order to address this concern, by email dated 17 November 2015, the Promoter provided plans for the phasing of the works to Faraday Avenue which demonstrate that the earthworks shall be constructed following completion of the Faraday Avenue works. I trust that this addresses the Council's concern on this point.

Additionally, the Council has raised concerns about the diversion of Hams Lane and seeks confirmation that access to the village of Lea Marston will be maintained at all times. As the Council is aware, the access to Lea Marston via Hams Lane is not the sole access to the village and as such, the village would not be cut off in the event that Hams Lane were closed temporarily. However, the Promoter is sensitive to the Council's wish to reduce the impact of the Proposed Scheme on the village of Lea Marston and is therefore prepared to offer the following assurance:

## 2. Access to Lea Marston via Hams Lane

2.1 Subject to the approval of the relevant statutory authorities under Schedule 16 to the Bill, the Promoter shall require the nominated undertaker to ensure that, as far as reasonably practicable, access to the village of Lea Marston via Hams Lane is maintained at all times during the construction phase of the Proposed Scheme.
2.2 Nothing in paragraph 2.1 above shall prevent the Nominated Undertaker from implementing such temporary traffic management measures as are necessary to safely manage the works.

## Kingsbury Road Railhead

As you are aware, the Promoter has been in discussions with the County Council regarding the type of junction to be provided at the entrance to the Kingsbury Road railhead along the A4097 Kingsbury Road. By way of letter dated 4 November 2015 (copied to the Council by way of email dated 9 November 2015) the Promoter offered the County Council the following assurance:
"In developing the detailed design of the Kingsbury Junction Works, the Promoter shall engage with the Highway Authority over the design of the Railhead Junction and give consideration to the merits of implementing, within the scope of the powers conferred by the Bill, one of the following alternative options:
a. a left in, left out arrangement for HS2 construction traffic accessing the Railhead Site from the Railhead Junction;
b. Constructing a temporary roundabout at the entrance to the Railhead Site from the Railhead Junction;
c. Constructing a ghost island for right-turning traffic exiting the Railhead Site at the Railhead Junction; and
d. a traffic management routing plan for $\mathrm{HS}_{2}$ construction traffic requiring access to the Railhead Site."

The Promoter understands from recent discussions that the Council is happy to let the County Council lead on this issue, but in any event I trust that the assurances set out above addresses the concerns raised in the Council's AP2 petition.

Use of Seeney Lane
At paragraph 16 its AP2 petition and during the course of discussions, the Council has further requested an assurance that Seeney Lane not be used by any vehicle entering or leaving the railhead site. As such, the Promoter is prepared to offer the following assurance:

## 3. Use of Seeney Lane by HS2 construction vehicles

The Promoter will require the nominated undertaker to ensure that throughout the construction phase of the Proposed Scheme, no part of Seeney Lane identified on Bill Plan number 3-47 in the Parish of Lea Marston shall be used either:
(i) by any large goods vehicle associated with the HS2 works entering or exiting the Kingsbury Road railhead site; or
(ii) for the purposes of parking any large goods vehicles associated with the HS2 works.

## Proposed T-junction at Manor Drive

The Council's petition indicates that it supports the work of the County Council in respect of the Proposed T-junction at Manor Drive.

As you are aware, the Promoter has been in discussions with Warwickshire County Council regarding the proposed T-junction at Coleshill Manor Drive and I understand that by an email dated 9 November 2015, the Council has been provided with a copy of the letter to Warwickshire County Council dated 4 November 2015. I trust that this addresses the Council's concerns on this point.

## Temporary Material Stockpile

Again, as you will be aware, the queries raised in the Council's AP2 petition regarding new areas of temporary material stockpile at the Kingsbury Road railhead mirror concerns raised in the AP2 petition of Warwickshire County Council. The Promoter has recently provided further clarity on these new areas of stockpile by way of letter to the County Council dated 4 November 2015, a copy of which was forwarded to the Council by way of email dated 9 November 2015. I trust this letter addresses the concerns raised in the Council's AP2 petition regarding temporary material stockpile.

## Access to land at Dunton Hall Farm

In its petition, the Council has requested an assurance that access to Dunton Hall farm will be used solely by agricultural vehicles.

The Promoter can confirm that the hybrid Bill powers only provide for the creation of a private access rather than a public highway at this location. Having considered the request for an assurance however, the Promoter considers that it would be inappropriate to offer such an assurance to the Council when this is a matter for the private landowner.

I trust that the contents of this letter accurately reflects the outcome of our recent discussions and would be grateful for confirmation that the assurances contained are acceptable to you. If you have any queries please contact Melanie Stevenson directly on 02079448090 or via email at melanie.stevenson@hsz.org.uk.

I have copied this letter to Melanie Stevenson, Steve Maxey and Alistair Lewis (Sharpe Pritchard) whom I understand is acting as your appointed Parliamentary Agent.


Appendix A - Bill Plan number 3-47

Ms D. Barratt
North Warwickshire Borough Council
The Council House, South Street, Atherstone, Warwickshire, CV ${ }_{11}$ DE

By email only.

Dear Ms Barratt

Assurances Relating to High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill - Petition Number AP2:146
I am the Director of Hybrid Bill Delivery at HS2 Ltd, which is acting on behalf of the Promoter of the High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill ('the Bill') currently before Parliament. I am writing to you on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport to set out the assurances that the Secretary of State is willing to give in order to address some of North Warwickshire Borough Council's ("the Council's") concerns regarding the impact of Phase One of HS2 (known as 'the Proposed Scheme').

This assurance will be included in the Register of Undertakings and Assurances maintained by the Secretary of State.

## DETAILED ASSURANCE:

In this assurance:
"HS2 Works" means the works authorised by the Bill;
"the Nominated Undertaker"
"the Promoter" means the Secretary of State for Transport or any successor Secretary of State or Minister holding the Transport portfolio or so far as relevant any Nominated Undertaker exercising the powers or functions under the Bill by virtue of an order under clause 43 of the Bill;

## Use of Seeney Lane by HSz construction vehicles

Following our recent discussions, the Promoter is prepared to offer the Council the following assurance:
"The Promoter will require the Nominated Undertaker to ensure that throughout the construction phase of the Proposed Scheme, except to such extent as any vehicles associated with the HS2 Works are required to cross directly over Seeney Lane, no part of Seeney Lane identified on Bill Plan number 3-47 in the Parish of Lea Marston shall be used either:
(i) by any vehicles associated with the HS2 Works entering or exiting the Kingsbury Road railhead site; or
(ii) for the purposes of parking any vehicles associated with the HS2 Works."

This shall supersede the assurance offered to the Council by way of letter dated 2 December 2015 regarding the use of Seeney Lane by large goods vehicles.

I trust this addresses any residual concerns the Council may have about the use of Seeney Lane by HS2 construction vehicles. I have copied this letter to Melanie Stevenson, Steve Maxey and Alistair Lewis (Sharpe Pritchard) whom I understand is acting as your appointed Parliamentary Agent.


Ms D. Barratt<br>North Warwickshire Borough Council<br>The Council House, South Street, Atherstone, Warwickshire, $C V_{91} D E$

## By email only.

Dear Ms Barratt

## Assurances Relating to High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

I am the Director of Hybrid Bill Delivery at HS2 Ltd, which is acting on behalf of the Promoter of the High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill ('the Bill') currently before Parliament. I am writing to you on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport to set out the assurances that the Secretary of State is willing to give in order to address some of the concerns of North Warwickshire Borough Council ("the Council") regarding the impact of Phase One of HS2 (known as 'the Proposed Scheme').

## DETAILED ASSURANCES:

In these assurances unless the context otherwise requires, the following expressions shall have the following meanings:

Bill | meansthe High Speed (London to West Midlands) Bill that |
| :--- |
| was introduced in the House of Commons on $25^{\text {th }}$ |
| November 2013 and upon Royal Assent includes the |
| resulting Act and clause and work numbers refer to |
| clauses and work numbers in the Bill as at introduction in |
| the House of Commons; |

commencement | means the carrying out in relation to the HS2 Works of any |
| :--- |
| material operation as defined by section $56(4)$ of the Town |
| and Country Planning Act 199o and commence and |
| commenced shall be interpreted accordingly; |

Nominated Undertaker $\quad$| means the works authorised under the Bill; |
| :--- |
| means the relevant nominated undertaker appointed |
| under the Bill as enacted and, in the period prior to the |
| Secretary of State appointing a nominated undertaker |

[^2]


Promoter

Proposed Scheme
and imposing the requirements on it referred to in these assurances, HS2 Ltd;
means the Secretary of State for Transport or any successor Secretary of State or Minister holding the Transport portfolio and includes so far as relevant any Nominated Undertaker exercising the powers or functions under the Bill;
means Phase 1 of HS 2 as described in the Bill.

## Old Salteians Rugby Football Club

At a meeting between the Promoter and the Council on $11^{\text {th }}$ May 2016, the Council reiterated the concerns raised in its petition number HL: 575 about the impact of the Proposed Scheme on the Old Salteians RFC. This is a matter that was raised in the Council's original petition against the Bill, petition number 424 and was raised subsequently in the Council's petitions against Additional Provision 2 and Additional Provision 4 to the Bill, numbers AP $2: 146$ and $A P_{4}: 261$ respectively.

As set out in the Promoter's Response Document to the Council's House of Lords petition number HL: 575, the Promoter has been actively engaged for some time in discussions to facilitate the provision of a replacement site for the Old Saltleians RFC and meets with the Club on a monthly basis.

The Promoter continues to assist Old Saltleians RFC with its relocation proposals, including the reimbursement of professional fees and encouragement for the preparation of detailed development plans. A legal agreement is currently being drafted which will set the framework for how the development might progress and the Promoter is preparing a formal business case for securing funding to potentially support the initial steps of a relocation prior to Royal Assent. While the business case and associated funding is subject to appropriate governance, an in-principle approval has been given. The Promoter also continues to work with the Club to consider how the timing and phasing of works, particularly early enabling works, can be arranged to reduce the impact on the Club.

I trust this offers the Council the comfort it is seeking regarding the impact of the Proposed Scheme on Old Saltleians RFC.

## Business Rates

At paragraph 6 of its petition number $\mathrm{HL}: 575$, the Council reiterates concerns raised in its original petition number 424 against the Bill regarding a reduction in its business rates income as a result of HS 2 . The Council indicates that it wishes to agree a formula with the Promoter which will be used to determine the amount of compensation payable to a local authority which experiences a loss in business rates due to the $\mathrm{HS}_{2}$ scheme.

Since receiving the Council's original petition against the Bill, the Promoter has worked closely with the Department for Communities and Local Government ("DCLG") to explore the likely impacts of HS2 on local authority business rates income. In 2015, the Promoter instructed property consultants and rating specialists, Montagu Evans, to provide their view on the likely impact of HS2 on the rateable value of the Council's business properties and rates income. Montagu Evans also provided an addendum report to give an indication of the likely impacts of rateable values on an annual basis. I understand that both reports have been shared with the Council as well as other local authorities.

While the initial report does acknowledge the likelihood of a reduction in the Council's business rates income as a result of the HS2 scheme, it also recognises that "it is likely that HS2 will lead to RV generation both in the short and long term" (Page 27). The report notes that facilities provided for relocated businesses may attract higher rateable values. It also notes that the Council may receive a temporary increase in rateable values as a result of construction compounds in the North Warwickshire area. Additionally, with Birmingham Interchange station only half a mile outside of its administrative area, the Council is likely to see an increase in job opportunities and wider economic growth in the area. The report goes on to accept that "whilst it is unlikely that this will extinguish the projected loss through appeal or deletion, some of the loss could be mitigated". However the report concludes that at this stage the level to which any RV generation may mitigate against the projected losses is difficult to quantify. As such, the Promoter considers it too early at this stage to conclude with any certainty what the impact will be.

The Promoter is however mindful of concerns raised by the Council and other local authorities and is therefore prepared to offer the following assurances:

1. The Promoter, in conjunction with the Department for Transport and the Department for Communities and Local Government will, in the financial year commencing April 2018, undertake a further review of the impact of the HS2 Scheme on the business rates income of North Warwickshire Borough Council and other potentially affected local authorities.
2. In undertaking the review, the Promoter shall engage with North Warwickshire Borough Council and shall have regard to any evidence presented by the Council and other affected local authorities.
3. The Secretary of State for Transport shall engage with the Department for Communities and Local Government regarding the findings of the review.

## Special Management Zone

By a letter dated $27^{\text {th }}$ October 2014, the Promoter offered assurances that North Warwickshire would be treated as a "Special Management Zone" in respect of community engagement. The detail of the assurances is set out below:
"In line with the Code of Construction Practice, the Secretary of State will require the nominated undertaker to ensure that appropriately experienced community engagement personnel are appointed to manage stakeholder and community relationships during the development of HS2 in North Warwickshire.

The community engagement team will include:

- A single point of contact for local authorities in the area;
- Named individual points of contact for affected property owners; and
- A senior manager accountable for effective implementation of the Code of Construction Practice in the North Warwickshire area.

The broad duties of individuals will include, but will not be limited to:

- Being the first point of contact for communities and local authorities along the line of route;
- Coordination between both proposed phases of the railway; including alignment of powers and construction approaches;
- Managing relationships with the local communities, businesses, local authorities and other stakeholders;
- Raising issues from the community within HS2 Ltd for escalation, resolution or clarification;
- Monitoring the progress of each item raised and keeping stakeholders informed of progress;
- Ensuring the HS2 stakeholder engagement framework is appropriately implemented; for the whole scheme
- Attending regular meetings with the lead contractor, local authority, local community and other stakeholders to discuss construction issues and forthcoming programmes of works; and
- Advising on the appropriate support mechanisms to be provided by the nominated undertaker which will be available to local businesses, land owners, voluntary and community organisations that may be affected by the works."

At paragraph 8 of its petition number $\mathrm{HL}: 575$, the Council requests that the Promoter provide an explanation as to (i) how it envisages the arrangements for the Special Management Zone will work and (ii) a timeline for bringing such arrangements into effect.

Following the meeting of $11^{\text {th }}$ May 2016, I understand that significant progress has been made in developing the engagement plan for the Special Management Zone with the local community. This engagement shall continue going forward to ensure that both the Council's and the local community's input is taken into account in developing the engagement plans.

As a further product of this process, the Promoter has identified the benefit of developing an internal Special Management Zone Project Group. The process has now started and you will be aware that an individual, Jonathan Lord, has already been appointed as Senior Engagement Manager for the Special Management Zone to lead on engagement going forward.

To reflect these latest developments, the Promoter is prepared to offer the following further assurances:
4. The Promoter shall, with immediate effect, establish an internal HS2 Special Management Zone Project Group which shall have responsibility for overseeing and delivering engagement activities in the Special Management Zone.
5. The Special Management Zone Project Group will continue to engage with North Warwickshire Borough Council and the local community from the date of these assurances to develop a detailed engagement plan for the Special Management Zone which will set out the Promoter's approach to engagement with the Special Management Zone both before and during the construction phase of the Proposed Scheme and will have ongoing regard to the nature of the Special Management Zone.

## Cottages off Lichfield Road

At paragraph 14 of its petition, the Council raises concerns about the impact of the Proposed Scheme on the residents of 8 cottages off Lichfield Road, Coleshill, which are subject to compulsory acquisition under the Bill.

As explained at the meeting of $11^{\text {th }}$ May 2016, the Promoter has already begun discussions with some of the residents of these cottages. As explained further, under section 39 of the Land Compensation Act 1973 ("the Act"), there is a duty on the local housing authority, in this case North Warwickshire Borough Council, to rehouse residents displaced by Compulsory Purchase Order. Under section 42 of the Act, the acquiring authority, in this case the Promoter, is required to indemnify the local housing authority in respect of the
costs of rehousing. As such, as requested at the meeting, the Promoter is keen to understand more about the housing stock the Council may have available to offer individuals displaced by the Proposed Scheme and would be grateful if the Council would provide this information at its earliest convenience.

I trust that the contents of this letter accurately reflects the outcome of our recent discussions and would be grateful for confirmation that the assurances contained are acceptable to you. If you have any queries please contact Melanie Stevenson directly on 02079448090 or via email at melanie.stevenson@hs2.org.uk.

I have copied this letter to Melanie Stevenson, Steve Maxey and Alistair Lewis (Sharpe Pritchard) whom I understand is acting as your appointed Parliamentary Agent.

Yours sincerely,


Roger Hargreaves
Director, Hybrid Bill Delivery
High Speed Two Limited


[^0]:    - Given the vagaries of the development market and the economy at large, it
    will always be the case that Local Authorities are at risk of experiencing
    some volatility in the income they receive from their retained share of
    business rates.
    - No authority is dependent on the business rates retention scheme for more
    than a third of their overall revenue resources.
    - The Government has always recognised that the rates retention scheme
    involves the transfer of greater risk to local authorities, alongside the
    potential for greater reward. A safety net in the rates retention scheme
    ensures that no authority's funding from the scheme drops by more than
    7.5\% below their baseline funding level.
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