

ALLOWANCE	DEFINITION	EXPLANATORY NOTES
Access	Access to the property relative to the standard for that market area.	<p>The District Standard for access in many of the pastoral areas is formed earth/gravel (Nil Allowance). Historical sales evidence has indicated the premium for all weather bitumen access varies depending on the location and land types/soils. In locations where there are areas of black soil there is a clear market preference for bitumen and this is often represented by a positive allowance of up to 10% above the District Standard. In other areas where the soils are predominantly well drained and not greatly impacted by periodic rainfall the market preference will probably be less. In many of these locations a positive allowance of up to 5% has proven appropriate. Regardless of the quantum of allowance applied, it is also generally accepted that these percentages be graduated or shaded from the "District Standard" over a 50 km distance.</p> <p>The following is a guide for access disabilities where the District Standard is formed earth/gravel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bitumen access <u>is standard</u>.....+50% • Formed earth and/or gravel but within 10 km from bitumen.....+.....-41% • Formed earth and/or gravel but within 20 km from bitumen.....+3-2% • Formed earth and/or gravel but within 30 km from bitumen.....+2-3% • Formed earth and/or gravel but within 40 km from bitumen.....+1-4% • Formed earth and/or gravel > 50 km from bitumen.....Nil-5% • Formed earth with significant areas of black soil – frequently cut in wet.....-2.5% • <u>Formed earth or black soil frequently cut for long periods by flooded creeks.....-5.0%</u> • <u>Cut off periodically e.g. during wet season.....-2.5% to -5% (additional)</u> • <u>Poor access for long distances, isolated and poorly maintained.....-7.5%</u> • 4WD <u>access required</u> or gazetted access but not formed/practical. Accessed via property tracks through adjoining property.....-7.5% to -10% • No dedicated access (May need to consider as added value).....Up to -20% <p>Internal access issues are generally addressed using the "Working/Broken" allowance.</p>
Erosion	The property is susceptible to a level of erosion significantly above the District Standard.	Whilst the slope of arable land will generally be considered as one of the limitations in establishing the broader arable class and therefore gross starting values, in some instances it may be necessary to apply an allowance for erosion where the hazard is not widespread. This can be quantified by reference to the additional cost of soil conservation and/or remediation works required. It is applied to the affected area only, generally as an allowance on the classification line.
Flooding	The property has a probability of being partially or fully inundated by detrimental flood or tidal water.	This allowance is to reflect the need to de-stock large areas for significant periods because of the extreme risk of stock losses or the adverse impact on cultivation. Where possible this should be inherent in the gross rate for flooded land types. Generally -10% to -20% for the affected areas only is considered appropriate. Convert to an overall percentage. Not applicable in areas or land types where the flooding is an overall benefit (e.g. Channel Country).

Published on Resources RTI Act 2009

Lease Conditions	Application of Section 33.	<p>Whilst all land is taken to be granted in fee simple, as per section 33 of the LVA, this right must be considered and an allowance must be made for any limitation or restriction in use. The purpose and condition of the right/lease must be considered.</p> <p>For the leases over Unallocated State Land (USL) where the purpose of the lease is Grazing, or Business (Grazing) and the lease does not specifically exclude the construction of a dwelling, no allowance is generally made as there is not considered to be any restrictions in use.</p> <p>For permits to occupy over stock routes or leases /permits over reserves for grazing purposes only where the highest and best use is the added value to the adjoining land or they are tied by condition to the adjoining land they should be valued on that basis. This is undertaken on a standard classification approach but using the size of the adjoining land/parent valuation. Where the lease adjoins an aggregation the valuation should be approached on a "Highest and Best Use" basis, so the adjoining land will be defined as the smallest saleable "Stand alone" component of the aggregation. Where the aggregation would be traded as a single entity this should be adopted as the adjoining land. An additional allowance of -25% is applied to recognise the fact that you cannot build on the area and there is potential use by travelling stock and the public.</p> <p>The valuations for large leases or Stock Grazing Permits over State Forests will vary to some extent depending on the specific conditions. Where the lease stipulates the stocking rate, this is adopted as the carrying capacity for the land type. Over and above this, a -25% allowance is usually applied to recognise the restrictive conditions including those that prevent residential use and intensive development.</p> <p>The valuation of smaller stand-alone leases or permits in the closer settled areas can be more difficult to accommodate using these set allowances. In some cases where primary production values are similar to the site values the -25% allowance may not be sufficient to off-set the fact that the lease can't be used for residential purposes.</p>
Location	The location of the property relative to the standard for that market area.	<p>The District Standard location is considered the typical or most commonly occurring in that market area. This is generally established by first identifying the best locations and the worst locations in terms of the grazing or farming enterprise. Typically the best location will be around the administrative centres and/or the edge of the LGA closest to the coast or any adjacent larger towns or markets/processing facilities. In many cases there are multiple locational factors at work so it is not simply a case of measuring a distance from one central location. Often it is best to establish locational bands for the market area. These are established by drawing concentric 10 km – 20 km rings on the main arterial shire roads from what is considered the best locations radiating to the worst more remote areas. These are then merged to form bands.</p> <p>The District Standard (zero allowance) is then represented by the band or bands that encompass the most properties. Where possible this band should represent the middle of the location range. This will minimise the maximum allowances that need to be applied.</p>

		<p>Historical evidence in many of the larger pastoral areas suggests that a 1% adjustment for location for every 10 km from the District Standard may be a useful starting point for modelling.</p> <p>Once you get within 50 km (school bus range) from major settlements most models will need some form of adjustment. With the smaller western townships where there is not a significant rural home site market, this superior situation can be identified by using a "Town Proximity" allowance.</p> <p>Where there is a recognised rural home site market, this merge becomes more complicated. The question to ask here is whether or not it is location or size at work. In many cases it will be size/total money and this is best addressed by setting up a new SMA and QCALC basis that loads the smaller properties by a higher percentage than those in remote locations where there value per hectare is only slightly higher than the larger properties.</p> <p>If locality allowances exceed a range of 20% some thought should be given to the appropriateness of that Sub Market Area boundary.</p>
Mining	The use or rights of the property are impacted by mining or the extraction of petroleum or gas and/or the registration of mining or petroleum leases.	<p>Whilst there is a material difference in the approach to valuations undertaken for compensation in relation to the issue of mining and petroleum leases and the impact of mining and petroleum leases on the unimproved valuation of a parent property, in the absence of unimproved cases, these compensation cases (land, severance and injurious affection component only) can be used as a broad guide on a percentage basis for establishing a diminution in value / allowance from an unburdened gross value.</p> <p><u>Mining Leases</u></p> <p>In terms of unused mining leases issued over large grazing properties, the market evidence has historically not supported an allowance.</p> <p><i>Barrett v Weir and Gregcarbil Pty Ltd (2009) QLCR 0182</i> provides some general support for this. It was a compensation case relating to the renewal of a 71.2743 ha mining lease over a grazing aggregation (6,458 ha) near Clermont. The Court determined compensation for the diminution of the use of land and improvements at \$3,750 which was based on a loss of 25% of the land value for the 15 ha that would be disturbed/used as per the Operation Plan if mining did occur. This equated to approximately 0.3% overall of the unimproved value at that time. Based on the nominal value involved, it is difficult to argue that an allowance should be made for similar mining leases in the unimproved valuation struck for large grazing properties.</p> <p>In instances where there is an operational mine, the historical approach has generally been to allow a nominal value for the mine (worsement) area and associated infrastructure excluded from grazing use and then an overall percentage allowance for the diminution in value/impact on the balance. This is essentially quantified in a similar way to severance and injurious affection in a compensation context.</p> <p>In this regard, some direction can be gleaned from <i>Smith v Cameron (1986) 11 QLCR 64</i> and <i>Wills v Minerva Coal Pty Ltd (No.2) (1998) 19 QLCR 297</i>.</p>

Both cases utilised a “before and after” approach to assessing the deprivation of the use of the surface area and improvements, severance and injurious affection.

Smith v Cameron involved compensation for the issue of two mining lease totalling 206 ha (16.6%) over a 1,235 ha mixed farming and grazing property near Clermont. The Court basically allowed full value for the area of the mining lease and 10% diminution of value of the balance. In striking the 10% diminution of the balance the Court took into account the fact that the owner would still have use of some parts of the mining leases.

Wills v Minerva Coal Pty Ltd relates to compensation for the issue of 930 ha (19%) open cut coal mining lease over a 4,865.2 ha mixed farming/grazing aggregation (“Lexington”) located 48 km south of Emerald. Whilst the exact apportionment of the “after” valuation in terms of what diminution is applied to the balance is not clear in the decision, if full value as per the “before” valuation is applied to the land lost, the decision suggests that the Court has applied a diminution of 28%.

Based on these and other decisions, there is clearly a relationship between the size of the mine and the diminution in value percentage applied to address the impact on the operation and use of the balance of the property. Possibly the best way to represent this is to allow an unavailable value for the mine site and infrastructure and a percentage diminution for the balance based on the size of the mine relative to the size of the property. In uniform land types this effectively means you apply a Nil or nominal value to twice the area of the mine area.

The following is a guide for allowances for active surface mining leases over pastoral/broad acre lands.

- Mining Lease issued over property – Not used or very small area involved.....Nil
- Operational Mine – Unavailable value for the mine and infrastructure + percentage allowance based on size of mine relative to overall property. e.g. Mine 400 ha on 2,000 ha property.-20%
- Operational Mine – Unavailable value for the mine and infrastructure + percentage allowance based on size of mine relative to overall property. e.g. Mine 400 ha on 5,000 ha property.- 8.0%
- Operational Mine – Unavailable value for the mine and infrastructure + percentage allowance based on size of mine relative to overall property. e.g. Mine 400 ha on 10,000 ha property.- 4.0%
- Operational Mine – Unavailable value for the mine and infrastructure + percentage allowance based on size of mine relative to overall property. e.g. Mine 400 ha on 20,000 ha property.- 2.0%

Adopt -20% maximum.

For active underground mining leases, the general practice is to allow an unavailable value for the mine head and associated infrastructure and a diminution in value to address the impact of the operation on the use of the balance of the property. This once again this is effectively quantified in the absence of market evidence by a piecemeal approach in terms of severance and injurious affection as a result of the mining. The highest and best use of the land is grazing, the surface

Published on Resources Disclosure Log
RTI Act 2009

		<p>mining allowance methodology can be used as a guide using the area of the mine head and associated infrastructure. In mixed farming areas the worsenment caused by slumping can be more significant and in these circumstances an allowance is applied to the affected area. In this case an allowance range of -5% to -20% for the affected area is considered appropriate.</p> <p><u>Fossicking</u> As a general rule most fossicking is now regulated and occurs in declared Fossicking Areas (<i>Fossicking Act 1994</i>) or can only occur on private land with the consent of the owner and as such is not a major issue.</p> <p>In instances where unauthorised fossicking is occurring it may still be appropriate to make an allowance where this impacts on the use or management of a property. The allowance applied will depend on the size of the area impacted relative to the overall property size and any associated disturbance. The methodology used for mining leases as detailed above can be used as a guide. It is anticipated that a mining allowance for fossicking should not exceed -10%. Where an allowance for fossicking is applied the full details of the size, location and impact of the fossicking must be recorded in the remarks.</p> <p><u>Coal Seam Gas – (Refer Gas Valuations Meeting # 3 Minutes)</u></p> <p>Allowance is only to be given for production wells as these are actively used.</p> <p>No allowance is to be given for exploration or appraisal wells.</p> <p>The minimum total allowance per property is -2.5%. The maximum total allowance per property is -20%. For example 1 production well will have an allowance of -2.5%.</p>
Mix of Country	Represents the premium paid for a combination of land types over and above the sum of the individual classifications.	<p>In some areas market evidence suggests a premium is paid for a mix of land types or soils. Often areas of lighter forest country adjoining downs or developed scrub are considered to have additional benefits in terms of providing dryer areas or cover for stock in wet periods, quicker response time for pasture growth, complimentary native pastures and herbage, or superior catchment for dam sites and are considered to be worth more than the sum of the individual classifications. This is usually acknowledged by an allowance of +2.5% to +5%.</p>
Other	Generic allowance for non-standard allowances.	<p>Only for use in exceptional circumstances where the disability or benefit does not align to identified allowances. The reason and basis for the allowance must be detailed in the remarks.</p>
Perimeter/Buffer	The use of the property is impacted by the physical nature or use of the adjoining land.	<p>Typically this will be a negative allowance, where for example a military, mining or industrial use adjoins a grazing or farming property. The allowance applied will depend on the impact on the enterprise and will need to be quantified and detailed in the remarks. This is generally established by allowing a percentage diminution to the affected area/buffer then converting to a property percentage.</p>

<p>Pests/Weeds</p>	<p>The property is burdened by pests and/or weeds over and above the District Standard.</p>	<p>Market evidence has historically suggested that allowances for pest and/or weeds should generally only be applied where the occurrence or potential occurrence is significantly greater than the District/Market Standard. In most cases this will be due to the geographical position of the property.</p> <p><u>Dingoes/Marsupials/Pigs</u></p> <p>Only applied in exceptional cases. Where the issue is exasperated by the adjoining external land use (National Parks or ranges) the Perimeter/Buffer allowance should be used. Historically maximum of -5% for the affected area only. Up to -10% for the affected area may be appropriate for dingoes/wild dogs in sheep areas.</p> <p><u>Heartleaf Poison</u></p> <p>Heartleaf poison (<i>Gastrolobium grandiflorum</i>) is common on properties along the Great Dividing Range. It is not absolutely associated with any particular soil or vegetation combination, but is often found above the 350m contour on deep red and yellow sandy earths or skeletal soils. It is often associated with yellowjack (<i>E. Similis</i>) woodlands. It is poisonous to stock.</p> <p>Landholders generally manage heartleaf poison by reducing stocking rates in the paddocks containing heartleaf and completely de-stocking them during high risk periods. In areas where the heartleaf poison is thick and impractical to remove, the best way to determine an appropriate allowance is to significantly reduce (half) the carrying capacity for the affected land type. Where the entire property or the majority of property contains heartleaf, and the balance lands are not sufficient in size to hold stock during these high risk periods, a further allowance may be applied. In these instances the land type should be re-named to Poison Country and a note made in the remarks stating that the carrying capacity has been reduced to account for same.</p> <p>Where the occurrence is only isolated a -10% allowance for the affected area is considered sufficient.</p> <p>In some exceptional cases the poison is so thick and the grazing value of the land so poor it is difficult for cattle to survive even with very low stocking. In these instances these areas are usually fenced off and it may be appropriate to value these areas as unavailable.</p> <p><u>Parthenium</u></p> <p>Historically no allowance is made in market areas where it is common. Its presence on properties in “clean” areas does however trigger considerable market resistance and allowances have been made for these exceptions in Blackall/Tambo in the past. These allowances range from -10% for manageable infestations up to -20% for infestations where it is not financially viable to control.</p> <p><u>Prickly Acacia</u></p> <p>Historically, no allowance has been made in the downs for infestations that represent less than 10% of the property as this was considered both common (District Standard) and manageable. Where the infestation impacted on more than 10% of the property a sliding scale up to a maximum of -17.5% (35%-40% of property) was used.</p>
--------------------	---	---

Published on Resources Discovery
RTI Act 2009

		<p>Recent market evidence suggests that this was probably excessive as many landholders still value it as good browse. As a guide it is suggested that a Nil allowance still apply where under 10% of the property is impacted, with a -2.5% allowance to apply for each 10% of the property impacted over this to a maximum allowance of -10%.</p> <p><u>Rubbervine/Chinee Apple</u></p> <p>Generally widespread in market areas where it occurs. Historically market evidence does not support a specific allowance.</p>
Power	The property is not serviced by grid power or the power supply is limited/below District Standard.	<p>In areas where connection to the grid power is District Standard it may be appropriate to make an allowance for the small number of properties that were never connected, given that it is now not feasible to do so.</p> <p>In this instance, the allowance is possibly best quantified by reference to the cost of alternative solar/generator units. The following is a guide based on the size/carrying capacity of the property. Whilst initially based on a dollar rate, they should be converted to a percentage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pastoral property < 500 Head (AE).....\$ 50,000 • Pastoral property 500 Head – 750 Head (AE).....\$ 75,000 • Pastoral property >750 Head (AE).....\$100,000
Quarantine	The property is burdened by a quarantine order.	<p>In instances where properties are subject to an official quarantine or de-stocking order due to a disease or contamination for a significant period of time (> 6 months) an allowance may be appropriate.</p> <p>A useful precedent for a significant contamination on a grazing property is <i>Harvey v The Valuer General (V88-195)</i>. It relates to Dieldrin contamination on a 7,362 ha grazing property 90 km south west of Emerald called “Butha”. The case related to the unimproved value for rating purposes.</p> <p>Dieldrin had been used to treat the cattle yards for white ants and had inadvertently contaminated the site. Cattle from the property subsequently tested positive at the meatworks and the property was quarantined. The quarantine was lifted six months later but the cattle were subject to continued testing.</p> <p>Whilst the soil could have been removed, this was considered impractical. As the yards were located in the centre of the property, it meant considerable changes to management to reduce the risk of further positive tests. The appellant successfully argued that in his opinion the prospect of contamination would for many years deter any prudent purchaser from buying the property unless it was offered at a substantial discount.</p> <p>The appeal was allowed and the valuation reduced by 33%. The reduction was solely attributable to the contamination issue.</p> <p>Whilst this is considered to be the upper range for such an allowance, issues such as loss of income, holding costs and the likely overall cost and timeframe involved should be considered and documented. Any allowance made will need to be reviewed each annual valuation and may need to be phased out over time as the hazard/risk is reduced.</p>

Published on Resources Disclosure Log
RTI Act 2009

Severance	The development or use of the land is affected by a physical infrastructure or legal division of the land. (Includes non-contiguous properties)	<p><u>Power Lines</u></p> <p>Market evidence does not generally support allowances for power line easements on large pastoral properties. Allowances may be appropriate on smaller grazing and broad acre properties. These should be treated on a case by case basis with acquisition precedent used as a guide for the very upper range (See <i>P Joyce v The Northern Queensland Electric Authority of Queensland (1974) 1 QLCR 171</i>. This case involved three continuous powerline easements on a 2,671 ha grazing property near Townsville. The Appeal Court allowed full value for the base of the pylons and associated access roads plus 16% diminution in value for the balance of the easement area to cover all other heads of compensation.)</p> <p>As a broad guide, where an allowance is used on the smaller properties it is suggested that a 10% reduction be allowed on the gross rates for the area of the easement on grazing lands and a 50% reduction be allowed for the area of the easement on arable lands.</p> <p>It is preferable that this be recorded by allowance on a classification line if possible.</p> <p><u>Road and Rail Severance</u></p> <p>Road and/or rail severance is often difficult to quantify with market evidence and whilst it has been considered in many Land Court cases, there is little specific direction available. Severance allowances have historically ranged from -2.5% to -10% for the affected area.</p> <p>In practical terms, severance is best quantified by considering the diminution in value of the affected/balance area, then converting this to an overall percentage.</p> <p>For example, a road and rail severance through the middle of a property of uniform land types where each side is the same apportioned value would mean a 10% diminution to one balance area or -5% overall.</p> <p>Where a road and rail severs a property through one quarter of the property and it is uniform country, it would effectively mean a 10% diminution on 25% of the value or -2.5%.</p> <p>Where a road and rail severs a property through one quarter of the property and the balance is poor country equating to only 10% of the value of the property, it would effectively mean a 10% diminution on 10% of the value or -1%.</p> <p>The following is a guide for severance in pastoral areas. The percentage relates to the effected/balance value.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stock Route – Fenced or unfenced.....Nil. • Formed road – Occasional traffic only.....Nil.

Published on Resources Disclosure Log
PTM/2019

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local road – Fenced.....-2.5% • Shire road.....-5% • Highway, Rail or Road and Rail.....-10% <p>In exceptional circumstances a larger allowance may be appropriate. In <i>Webb & Ors v Chief Executive, Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Water [2007] QLC 66</i> the Court determined that the allowance of -5% to -10% (say 5%) for multiple severances was not sufficient and reduced the valuation by an amount equivalent to another -4%.</p> <p><u>Split Properties</u></p> <p>The allowance for non-contiguous or “Split” properties is generally referred to by the Courts as “Severance” and has been specifically addressed on numerous occasions.</p> <p><i>Bignell v Department of Natural Resources and Mines [2003] QLC 0054</i> – 29,540 ha grazing property 90 km from Cunnamulla. Court allowed -2.5% “severance” for a non-contiguous grazing aggregation, separation by one property only.</p> <p><i>Galwey & Ors v Department of Natural Resources and Water [2010] QLC 47</i>. Non- contiguous grazing aggregation near Roma with a total area of 6,236 ha. A -5% allowance made for “severance” – not seen as being in error by the Court.</p> <p><i>Fairfax v Department of Natural Resources and Mines [2005] QLC 11</i>. No contiguous grazing aggregation near Moura. Parts approximately 60 km apart. -5% allowed for severance – Accepted by the Court.</p> <p>The following is a guide for non-contiguous properties in pastoral areas. The highest value property is adopted as the “Parent” property, with the severance reflecting the diminution in value of the split/balance section. Like the severance allowance detailed above, the quantum of the allowance should be calculated based on the value, not area of the split/balance property.</p> <p>The following is a guide for split properties in pastoral areas. The percentage relates to the split/balance value.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separated by a short distance – possible to move stock without trucking-5% • Separated by significant distance – stock and/or machinery need to be trucked.....-10% <p>The allowance can be converted to an overall severance allowance, with the calculation noted in remarks.</p> <p>In the closer settled areas where aggregations of multiple non-contiguous properties or paddocks are common, a similar approach is to be adopted, for each split/balance property.</p>
Shape	The shape of the property is a relative disadvantage.	<p>A regular shape is generally District Standard. It is the most efficient in terms of building infrastructure and management.</p> <p>Allowances of -1% to -5% may be appropriate in exceptional circumstances for long, narrow or odd shaped properties.</p>

Published on Resources Disclosure Log Act 2009

Size	The size of the property is an advantage or disadvantage relative to the District Standard.	<p>There are two methods of size allowance available for pastoral lands – Head of Livestock and Dollar Value. As a general rule Head of Livestock is used in the larger pastoral zones where there is no farming, clearing or hobby farm merge. Dollar Value is used for the balance.</p> <p>Head of Livestock method uses a positive or negative allowance to adjust the net classification value relative to the District Standard sized property determined on carrying capacity. The larger and/or better the property, the higher the carrying capacity (Head of Livestock) and the larger the negative allowance adjustment to the net value. The inverse also applies, with the net value of the smaller lower total carrying capacity properties receiving a positive allowance.</p> <p>The matrix of Head of Livestock allowances are determined by “Paired Comparisons” of sales. The District Standard is generally statistically determined by establishing the mean and/or mode of the total carrying capacities of all the properties in the market area. The aim is to identify a band or range of total carrying capacity that is typical of the average or most commonly occurring properties.</p> <p>The Dollar Value method also uses a District Standard. It is best initially established by identifying the value band of the typical or average properties in the market area, generally with the most commonly occurring land type. Properties in this band become District Standard. Ideally a sale or benchmark property in this band is used to set the gross rates in the QCALC Basis after adjusting the other property allowances, but with a zero size allowance. To build a gross value matrix to equal a specific applied sale price that has allowances, the allowances must be adjusted in reverse. So to build the matrix for a sale property with an analysed sale price of say \$1,000,000 that has -15% in total allowances, the matrix must initially calculate a gross value of \$1,176,470 ($\\$1m \times 100/85$) so when you deduct the 15% you get back to the applied sale price. Sales and/or benchmarks are then used to set the balance of the size card. For example, to set the size for the highest value sale property simply work out the gross value that this classification will produce with the gross values established for the District Standard property, then adjust this with the normal QCALC property allowances in reverse. The adjustment required to get this amount to equal the applied rate for the sale is the size allowance. This process is repeated with all the sales and modified until a size curve of best fit is determined. It is then tested to make sure there is no overlap. Of note is the fact that QCALCS applies the size allowance after the property percentage allowances. Problems can arise when using Quality Rate Allowance (Dollar allowances) as the gross value is not adjusted by the dollar allowance but by the dollar allowance multiplied by the size factor.</p>
Town Proximity	Recognises the benefit of being located close to town.	This allowance is generally used to compliment the location allowance in situations where there are a small number of properties affected and it is not practical to adjust the broader locality allowance. Generally a maximum of 20%.
Water Benefit	The water supply available to the property is superior to the standard for that market area.	In many of the pastoral areas the District Standard for water will be access to groundwater at a reasonable depth (<50m), with reasonable supply and quality and/or suitable dam sites.

Published on Resources Disclosure Log

		<p>Surface water is usually described as permanent or non-permanent. Non-permanent supplies can often be more of a disability than benefit and are generally not recognized by the market as being of significant benefit unless greater than a 12 month supply.</p> <p>In the absence of specific market evidence, the benefit of permanent natural surface water can be best quantified by reference to the added value of water improvements on artificially watered sale properties in the same market. Whilst a review of recent sales suggests that in many of the pastoral areas this currently equates to approximately 15% of the respective unimproved values, this should be reviewed for each market area before being adopted. It can be as high as 20% depending on the relationship that exists between land values and costs at any point in time.</p> <p>If using 15%, water benefit of +15% is applied for properties that are wholly permanently naturally watered. Where properties are only partially naturally watered, it is necessary to work out the number of head naturally watered as a percentage of the total carrying capacity then multiply this by 15%.</p> <p>e.g. 400 head of a total carrying capacity of 2,000 are naturally watered. (400/2,000 =0.20)</p> <p>0.20 x 15% = 3%</p> <p>In areas where there is no permanent natural surface water, but groundwater supplies are significantly closer to the surface than District Standard, a positive water benefit allowance may be appropriate. This can be quantified to some extent by examining the savings in water infrastructure requirements when developing the property. Generally 5% maximum.</p>
Water Disability	The water supply available to the property is inferior to the standard for that market area.	<p>In many of the pastoral areas the District Standard for water will be access to groundwater at a reasonable depth, supply and quality and/or suitable dam sites.</p> <p>Where dam sites are limited due to porous soils and lack of lining material and/or bores are either very deep or have poor quality or supply (<1,000 l/hr) it is appropriate to make an allowance relative to the disability.</p> <p>The following is a guide for water disabilities based on historical market evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salty bores and limited dam sites.....-5% • Limited dam sites, bores significantly deeper than District Standard.....-10% • Not viable to obtain water or Nil available on property. Needs to be accessed externally.....-20% <p>Where the disability only applies to part of the property similar percentages can be applied to the affected area only.</p>
Working/Broken	The working and/or management of the property are burdened due to the topography or natural features.	<p>Includes issues with internal access – mountain ranges, river & creeks.</p> <p>The following is a guide for the working/broken allowance – generally only applied to the affected area of the property which equates to the smaller “Balance” component created by the natural separation.</p>

Published on Resources Disclosure Log

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal creeks, prevent movement of stock or machinery for extended periods.....-1% • Channels and/or ranges with moderate impact on management.....-2.5% • Major channels and/or ranges with significant impact on management.....-5%
--	--	---

Published on Resources Disclosure Log
RTI Act 2009