Lee Valley Regional Park Authority **LEE VALLEY REGIONAL PARK AUTHORITY** **SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** **20 JUNE 2019 AT 13:00**	**Agenda Item No:** **7** **Report No:** **S/50/19**

HOLYFIELD HALL FARM UPDATE

Presented by the Head of Parklands

SUMMARY

This report updates Members on the progress that is being made to improve the financial performance at Holyfield Hall Farm. Officers have implemented all of the required changes and after just one year in these changes are showing that the performance can be improved and the changes are having a positive effect. Many of the changes that relate to animals will take time to be realised but again are initially showing that they are achieving the desired results. A very positive year.

RECOMMENDATION

Members to Note: (1) the report.

BACKGROUND

1 Holyfield Hall Farm (the Farm) has been owned and directly managed by the Authority since 1976. The Authority purchased the working farm together with the visitor farm (Hayes Hill). The Farm has 600 acres of land managed as a mixed farm supporting a milking herd, livestock and an arable operation. The Authority owns circa 4,500 acres of land including many areas of parkland which is open to the public. The Farm also then provides grazing animals, which are important in the on-going management of nature conservation sites within the Regional Park, and is part of the visitor attraction at Lee Valley Park Farm. The visitor attraction is currently managed on behalf of the Authority by Lee Valley Leisure Trust Ltd (the Trust).

2 The Scrutiny Committee recommended to Executive Committee the Business Review report on 21 June 2018 outlining the Farm's performance and set strategic targets to bring a turnaround in financial performance over the following two years.

3 One of the actions was for Officers to update the Scrutiny Committee throughout the two year process and this report is the second such report.

4 The report will focus on the main targets and outputs.

STAFFING

5 A full review of the staff structure has been undertaken and put into place. The Farm review document has been built into the staff appraisal process which has provided the whole team with targets to help achieve positive results.

6 The new structure will provide in 2019/20 a reduction of circa £30,000 and include a reduction of 1FTE.

7 Officers have employed agency staff in the dairy which offers savings on costs and currently greater flexibility than directly employed staff. The new Arable Operative has been employed on a more flexible contract, this is providing an increase in performance and flexibility that the Farm requires and all arable works have been undertaken at the optimum time.

ARABLE ENTERPRISE

8

Target/Weakness	Performance
Weakness that the yields and inputs have not been formally measured and benchmarked against others. It looks like yields are below other benchmarked farms but this is more anecdotal see above comment.	Better data recording has been implemented and closer liaison with the agronomist is proving positive. All the cereal drilling has been completed at least 3 weeks ahead of usual and condensed into a period of one week. This means that chemical applications can be applied in one operation and not staggered to reflect the long drilling period of previous years. This is due to the new staff structure, better planning, new equipment and beneficial weather conditions. New tractor based software and equipment has been purchased to track and collate this information negating the need to manually input data in the office. This reduces the time spent on office administration.
Good rotation of crops with the inclusion of maize and ryegrass is a strength (See Appendix A)	Crop rotation is a key management strategy going forwards. The key problems now centre around grass weed populations which will take several years and careful planning to elevate.

DAIRY ENTERPRISE

9

Target/Weakness	Performance
Below optimum number of cows at 111 should be 125 with 150 in the herd	The dairy herd underwent a full test regime to check the underlying health situation. Johnes disease is a national problem and can result in several health issues. In consultation with the Farm vet it was felt prudent

	to enrol the herd into a Johnes disease monitoring program which has highlighted several animals testing positive. This is extremely difficult to manage and the decision has been made to undertake a natural cull of the infected animals. The Farm has 14 heifers to calve through June and July with a further 12 to calve in September. Current herd size remains at 111 with the optimum still 125 with 150 in the herd.
Herd is aging with a low calving percentage equals a low replacement rate.	The Farm manager has employed the services of a breeding advisor to improve our herd genetics and target the animals with a higher genetic potential.
Long average lactation and lower milk yields are affecting profitability. Poor heat detection is compounding the above statement.	Calving interval down from 460 day to 396 with the target at 385. Heat detection has improved with prompt submission rates and good conception rates. The Farm ranks favourably against the national KPIs.
Feeding of concentrates to improve yields due to poor swards is not achieving the desired results.	Full diet review undertaken in November. Yields have improved from 7,800 Ltrs per cow to 9,000 Ltrs per cow per annum. This has also had a positive impact on herd fertility and general health. Continued progress with the reseeding of all the forage grass area. This year will see the final year of the grass rotation reseeded with an increase in silage yields observed with this year's crop.
Grazing the dairy herd replacements of the conservation areas is impacting negatively on the dairy herds performance.	Business case being looked at to create a beef suckler herd to provide grazing animals for environmental grazing. This would allow a reduction in dairy numbers which, in turn, would help to insulate the Farm from the milk price troughs experienced in the past.
Need to improve the early months of the replacement dairy heifers to improve the herds overall performance.	On target growth rates, heifers are being put to bull 14-15 months which is the optimum age. First calving lactation average up by 7%.

BEEF ENTERPRISE

10

Target/Weakness	Performance
The conservation grazing has a negative impact on this enterprise due to the lack of good grazing that	All stock has been weighed at turnout. When weighed at housing it will give a better understanding of the

impacts by reducing the increased weight of the beef herd.	poorer growth rates achieved due to sward quality and restrictive management options afforded by the environmental schemes. Timelier moving of cattle has ensured better grazing swards.
Positive move to using an Aberdeen Angus bull from a continental bull should see improvements of converting the poor grazing into better weight gains.	Performance improvement still to be realised as they will take time to be seen.
Need to treat the beef enterprise as a separate cost unit (see Appendix B).	Part of the budget element, but better management of the account is making the process simpler.

MACHINERY

11

Target/Weakness	Performance
Farm is well equipped albeit the cultivation equipment is generally old.	A second-hand press has been purchased to provide more flexible seedbed preparation. The use of this has negated the need to power harrow the ground to provide a good tilth providing fuel and labour savings as well as faster ground preparation.
The Farm is high on horsepower for the size of enterprise. Older tractors are in need of replacing and this opportunity to consolidate the tractors and reduce horsepower should be considered.	One tractor has already been replaced with a lower horsepower (HP) machine, a second tractor which has been due for replacement for a number of years will be replaced this year. This tractor is now 13 years old and is starting to incur higher maintenance costs. This will allow the purchase of a more modern machine with the obvious advantages of better fuel economy and cleaner emissions and review of HP required.
Combine harvester could be re-looked at comparing hire and use of contractors (this is done on an annual timescale but not mentioned in the report).	This will be reviewed in 2019/20. The advantages of undertaking the harvest in-house means we are not relying on outside contractors to harvest the crops. This resulted in considerable lost production when contracted out in previous years. The combine will be paid off in 2019 which will realise a cost saving of around £8-9K in the transport running budget in the 2020/21 financial year. This machine should last upwards of 5 years before we need to consider renewal. The large capacity of the machine ensures a swift harvest which is extremely beneficial in a wet year. This also means lower

	maintenance costs as the machine isn't being pushed hard.

MILK VENDING

12

Target/Weakness	**Performance**
The hours taken to manage the vending machine are more than anticipated and are impacting on other duties.	These are being logged and efficiencies are now being seen as the tasks become second nature. Sometimes proving a challenge during peak periods such as harvest.
Good monitoring of the time, costs and income generated are required to fully understand the value/profitability this enterprise is achieving, 2 years of data would enable this to be evaluated	Initial evaluation of the budget performance has put the enterprise breaking even at best. The popularity of the vending machine with the public however has proved extremely positive and the milk sales are slowly increasing.

BUILDING FACILITIES

13

Target/Weakness	**Performance**
Additional air circulation is all that is required in the calves shed to bring them to the same excellent standards.	Ventilation fans are being installed in time for summer 2019.
Investment will be required within the next 5 years on the milking parlour (the parlour will not require this work within the time frames outlined in this report, i.e. the next 2 years).	Quotes are being obtained to improve the feeding system in the parlour which will be covered by the operational budget.
Redundant buildings provide little benefits and no return to the business, in a poor state of repair and are not appropriate for today's farming needs. Authority should look into the potential of these providing workshop/office/storage space for the Authority or third parties to rent.	Strutt & Parker have been engaged to look at feasibility.
Provide yard space for both the Ranger and Fisheries teams and the storage and handling of large items. These bring no direct financial benefit to the Farm but would incur cost to the Authority if it needed to purchase similar.	These areas have a market value of circa £35,000 so this is an unaccounted saving for the Authority. (see Appendix C)

DATA RECORDING AND MONITORING ACROSS ALL AREAS OF THE BUSINESS

14

Target/Weakness	**Performance**
This has been the Farm's achillles heal, as improvement to performance	Better monitoring and collecting data is now becoming "part of the day job"

could not be monitored and measured but this vital work has started.	for all staff. Cloud based data recording programs for both the dairy and arable enterprises have been purchased. These can be accessed on smart phones which allow everyday operations to be input immediately with all data automatically updated to the Farm computer.
Benchmarking against other similar farms needs to start.	This has started via Strutt & Parker. New dairy costings using Kingshay will automatically benchmark our data. This has no extra cost implications as will be carried out as part of the veterinary contract.
Introduction of timesheets for staff to enable better time/cost analysis across all areas of the business to be undertaken.	Timesheets are now being used by all staff.
A more detailed budget needs to be created.	This is on-going. The budgets are being scrutinised by the Farm Manager with help from the Project Consultant. Once these have been accurately broken down to the respective farm enterprises then a more detailed budget can be implemented

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

15 The net cost of the Farm in 2018/19 was £145,200 against a budget of £123,800, a variance of £21,400 and this was reported to Executive Committee in May as part of the revenue outturn (Paper E/624/19).

16 The budget for 2019/20 is £74,500 a saving of £49,300 compared to 2018/19.

17 The budget of £74,500 includes internal rental transfers of £38,700 which reflect the opportunity cost/market value of not being able to let the property on the open market. Excluding internal rent the cash cost to the Authority is £35,800. The Authority benefits from an estimated £136,300 saving of costs that are not seen, due to the Farm being run in-house including: saved GM costs through natural grazing; Biodiversity benefits such as appropriate habitat management; saved equipment/office storage costs for Ranger/Fisheries and other services; and providing a unique visitor experience for Hayes Hill Farm in interaction with the dairy unit.

18 As a comparable officers have evaluated the cost of leasing the Farm to a third party and it is likely that this would not prove cost effective as this would cost the Authority £30,900 and potentially not deliver the savings and benefits described above.

POTENTIAL FUTURE INITIATIVES

19 A London Brewery approached officers with a potential project of building a brewery, visitor centre and bar. This unfortunately ended with no further contact from the brewery from early 2019. Officers have had positive appraisals of very bespoke visitor accommodation lodge options. This work stream is currently being explored, with potentially looking at the wider Park opportunities. Plus the conversion of redundant buildings as described in Appendix C to this report.

CONCLUSIONS

20 Officers are very positive that the Farm has achieved the targets that Members have set and are positive that further improvements can be made. As described in paragraph 15 the Farm is currently proving good value for money and if the unseen costs/savings were included, the budget would be showing a profit of £100,500.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

21 There are no environmental implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

22 These are described in paragraph 15.

HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

23 There are no human resource implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

24 There are no legal implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

25 There are no risk management implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

26 There are no equality implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

Author: Jon Carney 01992 709 804, jcarney@leevalleypark.org.uk

BACKGROUND REPORTS

None

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE REPORTS

Scrutiny	S/45/18	Holyfield Hall Farm – Business Review	21 June 2018

APPENDICES ATTACHED

Appendix A	Arable Farm Report
Appendix B	Vets Report
Appendix C	Strutt & Parker Evaluation Report.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

FTE	Full Time Employee
the Farm	Holyfield Hall Farm
the Trust	Lee Valley Leisure Trust Ltd (trading as Vibrant Partnerships)
ppl	Pence per litre

FARM REPORT

Lee Valley Park Farms

Holyfield Farm, Fishers Green, Waltham Abbey

Simon Clark Harlow Agricultural Merchants

Currently the farm is under a new management regime which has seen significant improvements in the day to day running of the farm, better planning and timeliness of operations.

The effect of this change is a positive progressive approach where the benefits are starting to show, although the full effects will not be seen for a further 3 - 5 years as the unit will have to resolve some of the previous problems from the past management regime.

Improvements have been seen in rotations adopting an approach to consider soil structure, workloads, field conditions and productivity.

Spring Wheat is being grown along with Maize to try and reduce the grassweed burden, much of these weeds have some resistance to herbicides so an integrated approach is required.

The farm has continually used minimal cultivation's which have reduced the soil structure and allowed the grass weeds to increase. The current plan is to rotational plough along with spring cropping to manage the grassweed and resistance problem.

The crops on certain fields suffer intense grazing from the geese, this is an ongoing problem where little can be done to manage this issue due to the legislation and constraints currently imposed on the farm.

The addition of an experience arable staff member has improved the ability to carry out spray operations in an efficient and conscientious manner.

The farm recording systems are being improved and used more efficiently to manage stock levels and field operation recording to meet compliance regulations.

Manure management is an ongoing issue as the fields further away from the main farm will benefit from the farm yard manure and plans are in place to ensure they are treated, over a period of time this will aid soil structure and productivity.

In summary the farms potential and productivity has definitely seen advances

Under the new management regime, these improvements will continue but will take time to see the full benefits of these changes.

Simon Clark

Agronomist

BASIS Advanced Dip Ag

Harlow Agricultural Merchants

Lee Valley Meeting Report May 2019

Summary

The change in the cow's diet in November has had a big overall positive impact on the herd's production however whilst the cows adjusted to the new diet and started producing more milk the recently very good fertility of the herd declined, which can be expected. Now the cows have been on the ration for a few months we can see that the fertility has begun to improve again. Mastitis treatment protocols seem to be working well on new cases but an area to focus on now should be reducing the number of cows calving down with increased somatic cells counts. We can do this by reviewing the protocol for which cows receive antibiotics at drying off and culling chronically high cell count cows, which act as a reservoir for infection. The farm's progress with regards to Johne's disease is a great achievement in such a short time from starting to test.

Milk Production

The current 3 month rolling average 305day lactation yield has continued to increase to approx. 9750kg which has raised your 12 month rolling average to 9005kg currently. However at the end of February the 305day lactation, fat and protein all declined but have now recovered and improved.

In April milk recording milk kg, protein and fat kg compared was lower than 'expected'. Milk (kg) was 110.9kg less than expected where in Jan, Feb and March it was 82kg, 71kg and 51kg higher than expected. Looking at which cows are contributing the most to this it appears to be late lactation cows and this is therefore likely due to dry cows now being out on pasture.

Compared to the same time last year the herd milk production lactation curve is higher than expected based on previous performance, especially for early lactation cows. The cows appear to be utilising the diet better now that they have settled into the new ration, increasing milk production. Now we need to work on increasing the fat % of the milk and try to maximise the dry cow production whilst at pasture.

Fertility

The change in diet in November seems to have had an initial negative impact on the cows fertility, reflected in prolonged intervals between services, reduced services (submission rate), conception rate and reduced % of cows in calf by 100 days as a knock on effect. This is to be expected, especially with the increase in production. However after settling onto the diet these parameters seem to have improved again with excellent conception rates at 53% in January and 61% in February. The % of service intervals at the ideal 18-24 days rapidly declined between December and February to a poor 24%, the bar chart representing service intervals indicates cows were more likely to have been served 37-48 days later, meaning that the first cycle had been missed. Again we could attribute this to the change in diet. The % service intervals 18-24 days has now recovered and is back up to an extremely good level of 58%, which is higher than the average of the top 25% of NMR recording herds, which sits at 55%.

Compared to the previous 12 month period, conception rate has increased from 27% to 36% which is good progress but there is still room for improvement. Compared to the previous year calving to 1st service interval has improved by 8 days. Calving interval has improved significantly from 426 to

399 for the 12 month average but with a currently better 3 month average of 389, so moving closer to the farm's target of 380.

Somatic Cell Count (SCC) & Mastitis

Average bulk somatic cell count levels and the percentage of cows with SCC over 200 and 500 have all decreased since December. Bulk tank SCC improved from 193 in December to 152 with a reduction from 23% of cows with high SCC down to 16%.

Recovery from new and repeat cases of clinical and subclinical mastitis has improved drastically over the last 3 months, meaning that treatment protocols appear to be working for these cows. However recovery of chronically high SCC cows has reduced, this is likely due to the confirmed presence of pathogens such as Staph. Aureus which are notoriously difficult to treat. These cows can act as reservoir of infection for other cows and therefore cows with difficult to treat, chronically high SCC cows or those confirmed with Staph. Aureus should be culled from the herd to reduce the risk of infecting other cows which can impact negatively on productivity and antibiotic usage.

An area to aim to improve over the next quarter should be to reduce the amount of cows calving in with a high SCC. In the last 4 months, 6 out of 23 cows have calved down with their first SCC recording as high which were low when they were dried off. 14 cows stayed low across the dry period, 2 improved from high to low and 113 (Johne's positive) stayed high across the dry period and is a chronic SCC cow. From this, is does appear that majority of the cows are being protected by the dry cow therapy but there is room for improvement. To do this we are going to review the criteria for drying cows off without an antibiotic tube, as it possible that some of these cows may have had mastitis or high SCC earlier in lactation predisposing the cow to problems during the dry period and early lactation and therefore would benefit from treatment at drying off. Another factor may be chronically infected cows in the calving area being a reservoir for infection for cows when their teats open just before calving. Therefore by removing cows with chronically high SCC we hope to prevent these infections in early lactation.

Johne's disease

The farm has made an excellent effort to develop and implement a Johne's disease management plan, with good progress over the last 9 months. The number of Johne's positive cows has been reduced from 18 to 7 in this time and those positive cows remaining in the herd are being managed to minimise the risk of spread to calves.

St Albans

Strutt & Parker
15 London Road, St Albans
Hertfordshire AL1 1LA
Telephone 01727 738280

stalbans@struttandparker.com
www.struttandparker.com

STRUTT & PARKER
BNP PARIBAS GROUP

J Painter Esq
Holyfield Hall Farm

Direct dial: 01727 738 297
Mobile: 07990 824 660
Email: stuart.gray@struttandparker.com
Our ref: SMG/

Sent by email: jpainter@leevalleypark.org.uk

11 June 2019

Dear Jason

Holyfield Hall Farm – Indicative Rental Values

Thank you very much for taking so much time to show Ed and I over the farmstead last week – it was good to meet you and to better understand the setup. As promised, I am writing to set out our thoughts and advice in respect of indicative rental values for the respective parts of the site.

The Property

The site is well known to you, and I do not propose to describe it in any great detail. Instead, I have broken it down into the constituent parts with the numbering below referring to the attached plan.

a) Residential

i) Manager's House (1)
A recently refurbished semi-detached and curtilage listed house with four bedrooms. You advised that Paul Wallace assessed the rental value at approximately £19,200 per annum. Considering the location within a working farmyard, having reviewed comparable lettings I am of the opinion that the rent on the full side but broadly appropriate for the character, location and amenity of the property.

ii) Listed Farmhouse (2)
A large, four-bedroom semi-detached listed property, adjoined to the above and the old farm office. The house is in basic, serviceable order, but requires considerable modernisation to reach its potential. You advised that the farm enterprise was not currently renting the property, and I note that is currently offered for letting at over £19,000 per annum. The fact that it has been listed for some considerable time suggests that the asking rent is quite full, but it does not look out of place in the current market. It is unlikely to be a property that would particularly appeal to farm workers, unless they had a family of a certain age and size.

The property would lend itself reasonably well to office use, and netting off circulation spaces (as is standard valuation practice for office uses) I consider the rental value for this use might be in excess of £20,000. The space might also accommodate the teams currently occupying the portable offices in the yard, freeing them up for market letting.

iii) Gate Cottage (not shown)
We did not inspect internally, but you advised that the house is currently let to a third party (not involved with the farm business). The rental value assessed by Paul Wallace is approximately £16,800 per annum, which appears broadly appropriate in the market.

b) Open Storage (Ground Rent)

There are a number of yard spaces across the property, and those which are or have the greatest potential be commercially viable are numbered 4 - 12 (in total extending to 16,900 sq ft). In some cases, these spaces are occupied by containers or structures belonging to the rangers and fisheries although it is difficult to say exactly how much space they occupy as vehicle usage would appear to be ad hoc. In our experience, spaces of this type make £0.50 to £0.75 per square foot, which would suggest a theoretical rental value of **£8,500 - £12,500** per annum.

The Ranger/Farm/Fisheries portable offices are included as a ground rent assessment in the above on the basis that the structure is not owned by the farm. However, if these functions were elsewhere accommodated then the farm could acquire and let the offices. They extend to approximately 1,250 sq ft, suggesting a rental value in excess of £12,500 per annum – this sum should return approximately 20-25% on the cost of acquiring the structures (or similar).

c) Enclosed Outdoor Storage

Numbered 3 and 4 on the plan are areas extending to about 8,400 sq ft that could easily (and with little cost) be enclosed to a secure compound. Our experience has shown such sites to be valued around £1.50 per square foot, which would equate to over **£12,500** per annum.

d) Buildings (surplus to farm requirements and commercially viable)

i) Boat Shed (13)
Approximately 365 sq ft of dry, secure workshop space which would be appealing to the market. We would expect to achieve a rent in excess of **£2,500** per annum.

ii) Workshop (14)
Secure covered store/workshop with washing facilities which would appeal to commercial and domestic users. Approximately 730 sq ft of space which should achieve in excess of **£5,000** per annum

iii) Cart Shed (15)
Open fronted, covered storage in a convenient position in the yard. Approximately 650 sq ft which we would expect to achieve approximately **£1,250** per annum as existing. Enclosing the building to create a secure workshop unit could increase the value threefold to around £3,750 per annum

iv) Lean-to behind workshop and cart shed (16)

Logically combined with a secure yard (valued in (c) above), this long, thin dry store would appeal to small domestic storage users. Approximately 730 sq ft of space which should achieve in excess of **£2,500** per annum

v) Northern timber frame building (excluding spray shed) (17)
Currently suited to secure covered storage, the space extends to about 2,100 sq ft. Cleared and cleaned, we would expect to achieve in excess of **£6,000** per annum for the space as existing. With some improvements to create workshop space, the rental value could exceed £10,000 per annum. The building would lend itself to an office conversion, subject to the necessary planning consents, with a potential rental value in excess of £20,000 per annum

vi) Spray Shed (18)
Currently used by the farm, but with potential to be let for dry, secure, storage. Approximately 275 sq ft of space which we would expect to let around **£1,000** per annum. With some improvements to create more of a workshop space, the rental value could be increased to around £2,000 per annum

vii) Old farm office (19)
Relatively basic but serviceable office space and meeting room which could be brought up to standard at modest cost. Approximately 356 sq ft with an estimated rental value in the region of **£3,750** per annum as existing

In terms of accounting policy, it does seem odd that some of the buildings in the farmstead currently have rental values attached to them and others do not – I would have thought a sensible approach would be to value all of the property or none of it, for the purposes of consistency across enterprises. In a tenancy situation, commercial lettings income is often shared between landlord and occupier.

The success of rural commercial farmstead lettings hinges on starting with small occupations and taking care to find the right users. Ideally they would require limited vehicle movements, and visit the space relatively infrequently. Good tenants often find good tenants, and the enterprise should be able to grow organically without too much advertising in the early days (which can attract unwanted attention – see below).

Fisheries Complex

Broadly, the fisheries complex has been considered above within the ground rent section on the basis that the structures occupied/sited are not owned by the far. Areas 10 and 11 on the plan, which refer, have an approximate ground rent value within the above of £1,250 to £1,750 per annum.

The fisheries also occupy the adjacent pond which will have quite considerable value to them. It is not easy to value for the market as it is a niche beyond our usual expertise, but I would expect demand from certain special user groups.

Whole Farm Rental Value

Strutt & Parker's Farm Business Review in 2018 considered the option of letting the farm in some detail. Since then, there is some greater clarity about the future of farm subsidies although the slow moving Agriculture Bill and Brexit uncertainties mean that much remains unknown about the future of rental values.

Based on current best information and comparables, I estimate the rental value for the land, yard, buildings and Manager's House & Gate Cottage to be in the region £80,000 – 90,000 per annum.

This figure assumes a single Farm Business Tenancy incorporating all of the above and divesting overall control to a farming operation. The land alone might be worth in the region of £50,000 – 55,000 per annum, with the possibility that a small premium could be achieved by letting the land separately and investigating commercial opportunity for the yard and any buildings not required for farming.

Planning and Business Rates

Naturally, some of the suggested alternative uses above may require planning consents. We can provide further detailed advice if required, but as discussed when we met there could be risks involved in inviting the planners to the site which may help to guide thinking on building uses.

There is a further risk (with or without formal planning permissions, but more likely on grant of consent(s)) that increasing commercial use of the site could attract the attention of the Local Authority's rating team. It is usual for occupiers to cover the costs of business rates, but this highlights the importance of having suitable leases in place to divest responsibility if it becomes an issue. Business rate assessments tend to negatively affect rental values in that they create additional cost burden for occupiers. The figures above assume no assessment for rates.

I trust the above is helpful and gives you the information you require. If anything requires further explanation or clarification please do not hesitate to contact me. Please note, this letter provides indicative rental values only. It is not intended to be a formal valuation in accordance with the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors Valuation – Global Standards 2017 (Red Book) and should not be relied upon as such.

Kind regards

Yours sincerely

Stuart Gray MRICS FAAV
Senior Associate Director

Enc: Farmstead Plan