INFRASTRUKTURA I EKOLOGIA TERENÓW WIEJSKICH
INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECOLOGY OF RURAL AREAS

Nr IV/3/2016, POLSKA AKADEMIA NAUK, Oddział w Krakowie, s. 1673–1688
Komisja Technicznej Infrastruktury Wsi

DOI: http://dx.medra.org/10.14597/infraeco.2016.4.3.126

THE USEFULNESS OF REAL ESTATE PRICES AND VALUES REGISTER IN APPRAISAL BY COMPARATIVE METHODS, ON THE BASIS OF LUBLIN VOIVODESHIP REGISTERS

Jacek Zyga
Lublin University of Technology

Abstract

The article constitutes the part of broader studies on the issue of practical usefulness of public registers, comprising the databases on real property, in tasks related to real estate appraisal. It includes the results of research on the scope in which geodetic public registers (Land and buildings register as well as the Register of Prices and Values of Real estate) collect essential or only useful data to the process of land property appraisal. Presented analyses are demonstrated on the examples of above-mentioned registers, conducted in the offices of the district authorities in Lublin Voivodeship. The results of prepared analyses are critical. The researched public registers, operating in the current condition, do not have formal possibilities of collecting the range of essential information on properties. The studies showed that even though architects of databases, implemented in the departments of geodesy in some offices of district authorities, anticipated the possibility of registering specific useful data, nevertheless in practice appropriate fields of relevant registers remain unused.

Key words: cadastre, databases, real estate prices

INTRODUCTION

In Poland, cadastre does not exist in the full sense of this word. It is replaced by so-called the Register of Lands and Buildings, kept from the end of 1960s of the last century. However, from the point of view of the second decade

of the 21st century, the records of appointed register as well as the Register of Prices and Values of Real Estate (RPVR) can be treated as registers of cadastre nature. The conducted research and presented article are focused on this register as well as its contents. According to the author, and in contrast to the specific attitudes shown in the literature (Ninard 2016), rescinding the section 3 in paragraph 74 of Regulation on the lands and buildings register (LBR) does not determine the removal of RPVR from the Register of Lands and Buildings. The condition that decides upon the belonging of RPVR (especially logical one) to the register of real estate is its nature, not just the way and rules for making its content available (and it was defined by the regulation in paragraph 74, section 3). Even though RPVR formally needs to be available as the component of broader scope i.e. the state geodetic and cartographic resource, it objectively refers to the concepts of price and value of real estate, which prejudges its cadastre nature. Cadastre from the functional point of view was predicted as the system which aimed at supporting the process of land valuation (Larsson 1991, Kaufmann, Steudler 1998). Formal replacement of Polish Register of Lands and Buildings by the Cadastre of Real Estate in Polish legal system resulted from such a role assigned to cadastre (Wilkowski 2004, Mika 2010).

Unfortunately, in practice RPVR still remains the system not fully functional from the point of view of real estate management (Hopfer *et al*. 2012). Critical conclusions, inferred from the analysis of the Land and Building Register system, including RPVR, as well as developmental concepts and principles in terms of cadastre systems modernization, are still relevant (Dawidowicz, Źróbek 2012, Łuczyński 2015). This article is another contribution to the evaluation of cadastre condition in Poland but from the property appraisers' point of view engaged in real estate appraising. Thus, the research is focused on the elements of real estate description which are essential to the implementation of the rules of their valuation in the comparative approach, described by the Act on Real Estate Management.

THE SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF PERFORMED RESEARCH

The result of performed studies is the information from RPVR, collected and in fact made available to potential users, by particular offices of district authorities of Lublin Voivodeship. The research covered twenty three from twenty four RPVR of land and municipal districts. Due to technical issues, data from Janow Lubelski district were omitted. The studies were conducted on the basis of actual excerpts from particular registers.

Due to great diversity of analysed information, their volume and difficulty in terms of automation of data processing, it was decided to resign from the part of quantitative analysis in favour of qualitative description of state-of-the-art. In

the course of studies, the comparison of information on real estate constituting the objects of free-market transactions, referring to properties as a whole, land and buildings on these lands, was performed. The compilation does not include the list of information on unit properties or non-isolated units. In order to focus the considerations in the narrowly understood register of prices and values of real estate RPVR, the registers of information included in the collection of the entire geodetic and cartographic resource, likely to be used by a potential user, were not covered here.

In the first place, the ways of making available the information on properties being the objects of market turnover as well as the scope of revealed information and the way of its presentation in the particular excerpts from RPVR, were inventoried. Subsequently, they were compared to each other as well as to the standard which is the Specification of Conceptual Database Model of Register of Prices and Values of Real Estate (appendix no. 7 to the Regulation of LBR).

THE RESULTS OF CONDUCTED RESEARCH

In the area of Lublin Voivodeship, there are five different RPVR systems, operating simultaneously, which collect and make available the information on properties being the objects of turnover.

In respect of form similar systems are at the disposal of the City Council of Lublin, Offices of District Authorities of Kraśnik and of Chełm (TurboEWID) as well as City Council of Chełm, Offices of District Authorities of Biała Podlaska, Łuków and Krasnystaw (EGBV). While the Office of District Authorities of Włodawa uses completely different system (Rejent). The rest of District Offices use the same system (REJCEN). In the considerations, the way of data exchange between databases as well as of making the data of RPVR available to other IT or ICT systems as GML format (§ 74 section 2b Act on RPVR) was omitted. Analysed information from RPVR, transferred by district offices to individual users, not institutional ones, is usually in the form of text transcription (files such as: *.txt, *.rtf, *.doc or *.pdf). In the phase of data collecting, only the Offices of District Authorities in Chelm and Lukow made the information in question available in the form of spreadsheets tables in the following files: *.xls or *.ods. Moreover, the City Council of Lublin makes available gathered information through electronic means, via the Internet (currently this functionality is suspended). Then the scopes of revealed information and the way of its presentation were compared. Keeping RPVR, in any system, does not mean that collected and available information is the same. Both Offices of District Authorities in Chelm, Krasnystaw, Biala Podlaska and City Council in Chelm as well as the rest of District Offices, despite similar technical possibilities, build sets of

different configurations of registration fields. It is distinctly reflected in compilations prepared in Table 3, 4 and 5. They demonstrate obligatory scope of RPVR information along with registers issued by particular district offices as well as the degree of implementation of the LBR Regulation and the ranges of RPVR of particular district offices were evaluated. The assessment was performed by referring the information from particular district offices to the list of obligatory information which shall be gathered in RPVR in relation to transaction and the elements covered by it, indicated in the LBR Regulation. This list is shown in Table 1:

Table 1. Registration fields RPVR in relation to real estate as the object of transaction, introduced in the LBR Regulation

Class (field):	Registration field – attributes (original record acc. to the Regulation)
RPV Transaction	Transaction price, date of contract conclusion, transaction ID, type of rights being the object of transaction, type of market, type of transaction, purchasing party, selling party, share in the right being the object of transaction, VAT rate,
RPV Real estate	Type of property, description, surface area of land property, type of arable land, property price, type of encumbrance, details referring to encumbrance,
RPV Building Description	Building ID, existing infrastructure, building price, usable area of building from measurements, the main function of building, other function of building, VAT rate, building value,
RPV Land Description	Land ID, land lot, the price of land lot, the purpose of local spatial management plan, VAT rate, existing infrastructure, infrastructure possible to be fitted, the value of land lot, additional information,

Source: appendix no. 7 to the of Regulation on the lands and buildings register

RPVR registration fields from particular district offices were listed along with the above compilation. The results of these data sheets are included in tables 3, 4 and 5. Table 3 illustrates in how many cases the obligatory element was actually used in registers RPVR on the level of Lublin Voivodeship. The assignment of registration field to the group of attributes essential to the needs of property appraisal (both on individual level as well as on the level of analyses of broader nature) is shown in table 3, in column 2 (number 1). On the level of obligatory attributes (the number of 34), there are 22 distinguished positions. While, in columns 3 and 4, there are the numbers of cases of registration fields use in particular studied registers, corresponding to a specific obligatory element RPVR and the number of cases when a given registration field is used. Column 5 of Table 3 demonstrates (by a decimal) offices use registration fields corresponding to obligatory elements RPVR, given by the Regulation on the register of

lands and buildings, and the results in column 6 demonstrate which part of used registration fields is actually applied (by revealing the information used in them).

The results of inventory of application ranges of particular registration fields in RPVR of specific district offices are shown in Table 4-7. In tables 4 and 5 positions '1' indicate active use of registration fields. Positions '0' reflect certain registration fields functioning, yet without their actual use (these registration fields are not fulfilled in practice). Lack of any sign in proper cell indicates inactivity of the shown registration fields. The following assignment of columns is used in Table 4, 5, 6, 7:

Table 2. Identifications of particular offices of district authorities from Table 4, 5, 6, 7

Number of column in Table 4,5,6,7	Office of district authorities
1	Office of District Authorities in Biala Podlaska
2	Office of District Authorities in Bilgoraj
3	Office of District Authorities in Chelm
4	Office of District Authorities in Hrubieszow
5	Office of District Authorities in Krasnystaw
6	Office of District Authorities in Krasnik
7	Office of District Authorities in Lubartow
8	Office of District Authorities in Lublin
9	Office of District Authorities in Leczna
10	Office of District Authorities in Lukow
11	Office of District Authorities in Opole Lubelskie
12	Office of District Authorities in Parczew
13	Office of District Authorities in Pulawy
14	Office of District Authorities in Radzyn Podlaski
15	Office of District Authorities in Ryki
16	Office of District Authorities in Swidnik
17	Office of District Authorities in Tomaszow Lubelski
18	Office of District Authorities in Wlodawa
19	Office of District Authorities in Zamosc
20	City Council in Biala Podlaska
21	City Council in Chelm
22	City Council in Zamosc
23	City Council in Lublin

Source: own study

Table 3. Overall compilation of registration fields RPVR and frequency of their use in offices of district authorities in Lublin Voivodeship

Class (field) Registration fields – attributes	Fields concerning the property description	Number of cases of appropriate registration fields occurrence in RPVR	Number of cases of appropriate registration fields use in RPVR	Frequency of use of particular attributes in specific RPVR	The degree of utilization of appropriate registration fields in specific RPVR
1	2	3	4	5	6
RPV Transaction					
Transaction price		23	23	1.00	1.00
Date of contract conclusion		23	23	1.00	1.00
Transaction ID		23	23	1.00	1.00
Type of right being the object of Transaction	1	23	23	1.00	1.00
Type of market		20	20	0.87	1.00
Type of transaction		21	21	0.91	1.00
Purchasing party		23	22	1.00	0.96
Selling party		23	22	1.00	0.96
Share in the right being the object of transaction	1	21	21	0.91	1.00
VAT rate.		2	1	0.09	0.50
RPV Real estate					
Type of property	1	21	21	0.91	1.00
Description	1	20	18	0.87	0.90
Surface area of land property	1	9	9	0.39	1.00
Type of arable land	1	11	11	0.48	1.00
Property price	1	13	13	0.57	1.00
Type of encumbrance	1	3	3	0.13	1.00
Details referring to encumbrance	1	2	2	0.09	1.00
RPV Building Description					
Building ID	1	16	10	0.70	0.63
Existing infrastructure	1	3	3	0.13	1.00
Building price	1	2	1	0.09	0.50
Usable area of building from measurements	1	15	14	0.65	0.93
Main function of building	1	18	18	0.78	1.00

Class (field) Registration fields – attributes	Fields concerning the property description	Number of cases of appropriate registration fields occurrence in RPVR	Number of cases of appropriate registration fields use in RPVR	Frequency of use of particular attributes in specific RPVR	The degree of utilization of appropriate registration fields in specific RPVR
RPV Building Description					
Other function of building	1	3	3	0.13	1.00
VAT rate		2	1	0.09	0.50
Building value		1	0	0.04	0.00
RPV Land Description					
Land ID	1	23	23	1.00	1.00
Land lot	1	23	23	1.00	1.00
The price of land lot	1	5	4	0.22	0.80
The purpose of local spatial management plan	1	23	22	1.00	0.96
VAT rate		1	0	0.04	0.00
Existing infrastructure	1	7	2	0.30	0.29
Infrastructure possible to be fitted	1	6	2	0.26	0.33
The value of land lot		5	4	0.22	0.80
Additional information	1	11	4	0.48	0.36

Source: own study

Table 4. Compilation of obligatory registration fields RPVR and their application in particular district offices in Lublin Voivodeship (part 1)

Class (field) Registration fields – attributes	Identifications of particular offices of district authorities (shown in Table2)											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
RPV Transaction												
Transaction price	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Date of contract conclusion	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Transaction ID	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Type of rights being the object of Transaction	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Type of market	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1

Type of transaction		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
Class (field) Registration fields – attributes	Identifications of particular offices of district authorities (shown in Table2)											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
RPV Transaction												
Purchasing party	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1
Selling party	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1
Share in the right being the object of transaction	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
VAT rate.	0											
RPV Real estate												
Type of property	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
Description	0	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	
Surface area of land property											1	
Type of arable land		1		1	1			1				
Property price	1			1		1	1	1		1		
Type of encumbrance					1			1				
Details referring to encumbrance								1				
RPV Building Description												
Building ID	0		0		0	1	1	1		0	1	1
Existing infrastructure												
Building price										0		
Usable area of building from measurements					1	1	1	1		0	1	1
Main function of building			1		1	1	1	1		1	1	1
Other function of building						1	1					
VAT rate												
Building value												
RPV Land Description												
Land ID	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Land lot	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
The price of land lot		1		1						0		
The purpose of local spatial management plan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
VAT rate												
Existing infrastructure	0		0		1					0		

Class (field) Registration fields – attributes	Identifications of particular offices of district authorities (shown in Table2)											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
RPV Land Description												
Infrastructure possible to be fitted	0		0		1							
The value of land lot		1		1	1							
Additional information	1	1						1		0	0	0

Source: own study

Table 5. Compilation of obligatory registration fields RPVR and their application in particular district offices in Lublin Voivodeship (part 2)

Class (field) Registration fields – attributes	Identifications of particular offices of district authorities (shown in Table2)										
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
RPV Transaction											
Transaction price	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Date of contract conclusion	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Transaction ID	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Type of rights being the object of Transaction	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Type of market	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1
Type of transaction	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Purchasing party	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Selling party	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Share in the right being the object of transaction	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1
VAT rate.											1
RPV Real estate											
Type of property	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1
Description	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Surface area of land property	1		1	1	1		1	1		1	1
Type of arable land	1		1	1	1		1			1	1
Property price	1		1	1	1		1			1	1
Type of encumbrance											1
Details referring to encumbrance											1

Class (field) Registration fields – attributes	Identifications of particular offices of district authorities (shown in Table2)										
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
RPV Building Description											
Building ID	1	0	1	1				1	0		1
Existing infrastructure			1	1							1
Building price											1
Usable area of building from measurements	1		1	1	1		1	1		1	1
Main function of building	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1
Other function of building											1
VAT rate								1			0
Building value											0
RPV Land Description											
Land ID	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Land lot	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
The price of land lot						1					1
The purpose of local spatial management plan	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
VAT rate											0
Existing infrastructure		0							0		1
Infrastructure possible to be fitted		0							0		1
The value of land lot						1					0
Additional information	0		0	0	0						1

Source: own study

Table 6. Summaries of compilation results shown in Table 4

	Identifications of particular offices of district authorities (shown in Table2)											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
The number of all used registration fields	19	17	18	18	22	18	18	22	14	18	19	17
As above, in relation to all required ones (34)	0.56	0.50	0.53	0.53	0.65	0.53	0.53	0.65	0.41	0.53	0.56	0.50
The number of all actually used registration fields	14	17	15	18	21	18	18	22	14	10	18	16

	Identifications of particular offices of district authorities (shown in Table2)											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
As above, in relation to all required ones (34)	0.41	0.50	0.44	0.53	0.62	0.53	0.53	0.65	0.41	0.29	0.53	0.47
The number of used registration fields concerning the description of property	12	10	11	10	14	11	11	15	7	13	12	10
As above, in relation to the number of attributes concerning the description of property (22)	0.55	0.45	0.50	0.45	0.64	0.50	0.50	0.68	0.32	0.59	0.55	0.45
The number of all actually used registration fields concerning the description of property	8	10	8	10	13	11	11	15	7	7	11	9
As above, in relation to the number of attributes concerning the description of property (22)	0.36	0.45	0.36	0.45	0.59	0.50	0.50	0.68	0.32	0.32	0.50	0.41

Source: own study

Table 7. Summaries of compilation results shown in Table 5

	Identifications of particular offices of district authorities (shown in Table2)										
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
The number of all used registration fields	21	18	22	22	20	13	19	19	18	19	34
As above, in relation to all required ones (34)	0.62	0.53	0.65	0.65	0.59	0.38	0.56	0.56	0.53	0.56	1
The number of all actually used registration fields	20	15	21	21	19	11	19	19	15	19	30
As above, in relation to all required ones (34)	0.59	0.44	0.62	0.62	0.56	0.32	0.56	0.56	0.44	0.56	0.88
The number of used registration fields concerning the description of property	14	11	15	15	13	6	12	11	11	12	22
As above, in relation to the number of attributes concerning the description of property (22)	0.64	0.50	0.68	0.68	0.59	0.27	0.55	0.50	0.50	0.55	1

	Identifications of particular offices of district authorities (shown in Table2)										
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
The number of all actually used registration fields concerning the description of property	13	8	14	14	12	4	12	11	8	12	22
As above, in relation to the number of attributes concerning the description of property (22)	0.59	0.36	0.64	0.64	0.55	0.18	0.55	0.50	0.36	0.55	1

Source: own study

ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH RESULTS

As it results from the summary in Table 3, the certainties of notarial deed element: transaction price, date of contract conclusion, identification of transaction deed, are always noted. They occur in every RPVR and specific registration fields are fulfilled. In addition, the types of participants in transaction are demonstrated. In every RPVR, there are also registration fields for identifications of land lots as well as their register surface, the purpose in the local spatial plan (sometimes presented as 'function') and 'the type of right being the object of transaction'. Moreover, it shall be indicated that the issue of the last field was resolved more reasonably by the architects of particular databases and computer systems that operate them than by the authors of LBR Regulation since they placed the registration fields related to the attribute 'the type of right being the object of transaction' in the part of particular RPVR related to the description of land lot rather than to transaction.

Other conclusions from the analysis of completeness of particular RPVR are less positive. In the cases of the rest of obligatory attributes of transaction description, it is observed that there is great latitude in the selection of presented information on the object of transaction. The most commonly applied information concerns the topic of share which is disposed of in transaction, type of property, type of market, type of transaction (useful information enabling easier data segregation) as well as voluntary compilation of randomly configured features of properties and the features of the transaction itself included in the position of 'description'. Their frequency of occurrence extends from 0.87 to 0.91 (column 5 in Table 3). Whereas, the order to demonstrate remaining attributes of real property is only treated as a non-mandatory suggestion. Registration fields intended for them occur very rarely in RPVR. The average frequency of use of remaining attributes, shown in Table 3, column 5, was 0.29, at the minimum and maximum of this index respectively 0.04/0.78. These pieces of information, since they are given in RPVR, are systematically revealed. It is supported by

the high degree of utilization of appropriate registration fields, demonstrated in column 6, Table 3 (on average 0.68 for the discussed attributes). The lack of part of analysed information can be justified in some way. For instance, for the lack of descriptions of such attributes as types and details of encumbrances concerning real estate (frequency of use of these registration fields is 0.09-0.13), VAT rates (frequency of use is 0.04-0.09), the transaction price is broken into a land price (for particular land lots) and a building/buildings price (frequency of use is 0.09-0.22). This information may not be included into a source material which is a notarial deed. However, there is no explanation why other attributes are not demonstrated in RPVR, or why some RPVR do not include any suitable registration fields. The source of information for these registration fields is thus, available to authorities of district offices, different type of registers of geodetic and cartographic resource as a whole (particularly the register of lands and buildings itself, the basic map (and currently BDOT500 basis) or the Geodetic Register of Infrastructural Networks).

The picture of recommendations implementation of the LBR Regulation arises from the compilation in Table 4 and 5. The information capacity of particular RPVR, which is measured by the number of all applied registration fields and their ratio in relation to the number of all required fields as well as the degree of implementation of property appraiser's needs who is interested in the description extensiveness of the transaction objects included in RPVR, is shown in the summaries (Table 6 and 7) of both parts of compilation included in Table 4 and 5. The degree of implementation of these needs, understood as the detail of transaction objects, is expressed by the number of applied registration fields related to the description of property as well as their ratio in relation to the number of appropriate number of fields required in this area. Every of the above numbers was completed by the actual number of fulfilled registration fields. The summary of Table 6 and 7 is Table 8 which demonstrates the maximum and minimum degrees of requirements fulfillment of the LBR Regulation regarding the content of RPVR.

Table 8. Presentation of extreme results from Table 6 and 7

Controlled elements	Minimum value	Average value	Maximum value
The number of all applied registration fields	13.00	19.3	34.00
As above. in relation to all required ones (34)	0.38	0.57	1.00
The number of all actually applied registration fields	10.00	17.8	30.00
As above. in relation to all required ones (34)	0.29	0.52	0.88
The number of applied registration fields related to the description of property	6.00	12.1	22.00

Controlled elements	Minimum value	Average value	Maximum value
As above. in relation to the number of attributes related to the description of property (22)	0.27	0.55	1.00
The number of all actually applied registration fields related to the description of property	4.00	10.9	22.00
As above. in relation to the number of attributes related to the description of property (22)	0.18	0.49	1.00

Source: Own study

SUMMARY

The inventory of the data gathering and making the information available on the real property being the object of free-market transactions, referring to property as a whole, land lots and buildings on these lots in RPVR of particular offices of district authorities of Lublin Voivodeship, was performed in the course of conducted research. The results of inventory were compiled with the obligatory scope of RPVR information, indicated in the LBR Regulation.

Among the analysed excerpts from RPVR issued by particular offices of district authorities, solely the City Council of Lublin uses the set of registration fields fully corresponding to the requirements of the LBR Regulation. In other cases, the number of used registration fields oscillates from 13 to 34 at the average number of 19.3, which constitutes that, on average within Lublin Voivodeship, these requirements are fulfilled in 57%, and there are the cases that the requirements of LBR Regulation within the scope of RPVR are implemented at the level of 38%. When the numbers of actually used registration fields are taken into account, this coefficient decreases in the extreme cases to 29%. In reference to the number of applied registration fields concerning the description of property, presented prices decrease respectively to 27% and 18% at averages within Lublin Voivodeship of 55% (number of used registration fields concerning the description of property) and 49% (number of actually used registration fields concerning the description of property).

Coming back to the issue defined in the title of article, unfortunately it needs to be stated that public registers of prices and values of properties within Lublin Voivodeship are kept in the way that significantly deviates from the requirements contained in the LBR Regulation. For this reason, their usefulness in the appraisal of real estate by the methods of comparative approach is limited. It is strictly perceived by professional groups related to the services of real estate market; particularly by entities occupied by real estate appraisal. In the comparative approach, in accordance with Art. 153 paragraph 1 of the Act on real estate management, apart from the knowledge of similar properties prices, also

the knowledge of properties features are required. In practice, this information is not provided or is provided in the negligible amount by RPVR. The lack of appropriate and verified information on the features of properties, being the object of market turnover, forces gathering this information by every interested entity separately and these results in the incoherence of data on which simultaneous estimations are based. Without credible and homogeneous sources of information, there is no reliable implementation of particular procedures of appraisal and repeatability of their results. Due to the shortage of information in RPVR, the recipients of appraisals (including appropriate public administrative authorities) have no possibilities of control over the reliability of submitted appraisals, whereas, the control of certificate suitability (which can be appraisal report) constitutes the obligation of authorities to conduct the procedures.

Detailed research performed on the material from the offices of district authorities from Lublin Voivodeship does not provide any grounds for generalizations across the country. Nevertheless, it generates a clear signal to the verification of the discussed issue in other regions.

REFERENCES

Dawidowicz A., Źróbek R. (2012). *Ustalenie wzorcowych wyznaczników systemu katastralnego w świetle aktualnych badań*, Studia i Materiały Towarzystwa Naukowego Nieruchomości, vol. 20 (4), pp. 5-17

Hopfer A., Cegielski S., Pietrzak L. (2012). *Reformy katastru nieruchomości w Polsce w skali lokalnej i globalnej*, *Сучасні досягнення геодезичної науки та виробництва*, Збірник наукових праць Західного геодезичного товариства УТГК, Vol. 2(24), pp. 12-25.

Kaufmann J., Steudler D. (1998). *Cadastre 2014, a vision for a future cadastral system*, Proceedings of Working Group 1 of FIG Commission 7, pp. 38

Larsson, G., (1991). *Land Registration and Cadastral Systems*, Tools for land information and management. Longman S&T, Essex,1991.

Łuczyński R. red. (2015). *Aktualne problemy katastru w Polsce,* OWPW, Warszawa, pp.103-122.

Mika M., (2010). *Historia katastru polskiego,* Infrastruktura i ekologia terenów wiejskich, vol. 6/2010, pp. 75–85

Ninard G. (2016). *Udostępnianie Danych,* Geodeta, vol. 2 (249), pp. 30-33

Wilkowski W. (2004). *Prawne i geodezyjne uwarunkowania współczesnych trendów w gospodarce nieruchomościami*, Prace Instytutu Geodezji i Kartografii, tom L z. 107, pp. 229-244.

Rozporządzenie Rady Ministrów z dnia 21 września 2004 r. W sprawie wyceny nieruchomości i sporządzania operatu szacunkowego (Dz.U. 2004 nr 207 poz. 2109 z późniejszymi zmianami). [Regulation of the Council of Ministers of 21 September 2004. On the valuation of the property and the preparation of the valuation report, Journal of Laws 2004 No. 207, item. 2109, as amended.]

Rozporządzenie Ministra Rozwoju Regionalnego i Budownictwa z dnia 29 marca 2001 r. W sprawie ewidencji gruntów i budynków (Dz. U. z 2015 r. poz. 542 z późniejszymi zmianami) [Regulation of the Minister Regional Development and Building Industry of 29 March 2001. On land and buildings register, Journal of Laws 2015, item. 542, as amended.]

Ustawa z dnia 21 sierpnia 1997 o gospodarce nieruchomościami r. (Dz. U. z 2015r. poz. 782) [The Act of 21 August 1997. On Real Property Management Journal of Laws 1997 No. 115, item 741 as amended.]

Ustawa z dnia 17 maja 1989 r. Prawo geodezyjne i kartograficzne (Dz.U. z 2014r poz. 897) [The Act of 17 May 1989 on the geodetic and cartographic Law, Journal of Laws, 2014 item 897 as amended.]

Eng Jacek Zyga, PhD
Department of Geotechnics,
Faculty of Engineering and Architecture,
Lublin University of Technology,
20-618 Lublin, Nadbystrzycka str. 40
e-mail: j.zyga@pollub.pl,
mob. tel. 601172798

Received: 02.08.2016
Accepted: 29.11.2016