

From: [Lauren Hewitt](#)
To: [State Development Infrastructure and Industry Committee](#)
Subject: Submission: Richard Hawkins
Date: Friday, 3 August 2012 4:00:37 PM

The Research Director

State Development

Infrastructure and Industry Committee

Parliament House

George Street

Brisbane QLD 4000

Tuesday, July 31, 2012

RE: Inquiry into the future and continued relevance of
Government land tenure across Queensland

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Parliamentary Inquiry into 'the Future and Continued Relevance of Government Land Tenure across Queensland.'

As a primary producer, my future business is predicated on secure tenure and regulation.

Below, I have detailed my concerns and issues associated with my tenure and attempted to provide some suggested methods through which these could be addressed.

My Enterprise

· **I hold the following tenure type/s**

- Pastoral Holding/Term Lease
- Grazing Homestead Perpetual Lease

· **My primary production includes**

- Cattle

My Tenure Issues

· **I believe that the following conditions or actions by Government have affected my ability to manage this land effectively**

- Restrictions on the ability to convert tenure
- Tied leases/Additional Areas
- Duration of lease term
- Onerous and/or poor conditions set by lease agreements
- Fragmentation of title
- High leasehold rents are rendering my business unprofitable

· **This issue/s have affected my enterprise because:**

To avoid over/under utilization of land with consequent land degradation it is now important to invest much more in infrastructure. Graziers will be reluctant to commit such great investment knowing that it may be lost within the lifetime of that investment when the lease term expires(as the infrastructure needs to be renewed it's life will always over run the term of the lease). Veg' management laws (that penalised those who had proceeded to clear their land cautiously, the most) have taught landholders not to naively trust Government anymore; not to trust it to renew the lease or compensate for losses.

Similarly such high rent restricts what can be spent on fencing and watering land and thus improving grazing evenness.

Rents based on Unimproved Capital Value tend to penalise the industry for it's collective innovation. The value of efficiencies and ease of management in methods developed and adopted by land holders and paid staff is reflected in the land sale price but is claimed by Government in the UCV.(ie land prices would not be nearly so high if agricultural industry was still operating as it was in 1870.Not all of the advance is due to industry method innovation but very much of it is; Conversely, there is no deduction for the great cost of all the failed experiments.)

Fair land rent should reflect the fact that land holders(including householders) pay a disproportionate amount of local government tax in relation to their income compared to what larger businesses such as the mines and supermarkets pay.(Rates are a tax; not a fee for service)

· **My suggested solutions to rectify this issue/s are:**

Term leases need to be converted to perpetual leases or freehold.
Rents need to be viable and should not be based on UCV.
Leasehold land needs to be easily convertible to freehold so that families have confidence that their effort will have reward eventually.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on this significant inquiry.

Best regards,

My Contact Details

· **Full Name**

Richard Hawkins

· **E-mail**

[REDACTED]

· **Address**