Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Dartford CIL Draft Charging Schedule. The NFU, together with other agricultural industry representative organisations, lobbied central government in 2009 for an exemption from CIL for agricultural development. I attach the relevant report, which is based on four main arguments:

1. Agricultural development results in little or no uplift in land value from which CIL could be drawn. CIL charges would therefore have to be met from the income of the business.
2. The economic viability of agricultural development would be adversely affected by CIL, as consideration would have to be taken of the impact of the levy compared to revenues returned from the development.
3. Food production is becoming more important strategically as populations rise and productive area reduces. UK agriculture will have to make the right investments to meet this increased demand. CIL would have an impact on marginal investments, preventing the industry form becoming more productive and more adaptable to changes in demand.
4. The impact of agricultural development on infrastructure would in the majority of cases be minimal. Most development takes place within the boundaries of an existing business.

The draft schedule of charges indicates that agricultural development would be classified "other development types – industrial", attracting a charge of £25/sq.m.

For the reasons outlined above and explained in more detail in the attachment, we request that consideration be given to a zero rate of CIL for agricultural development.

Yours sincerely,

John Archer
Regional Environment & Land Use Adviser

NFU South East Region
Unit 8 Rotherbrook Court
Bedford Road
Petersfield
Hampshire
GU32 3QG

Our reference: FMC/ar/A1552005

21 October 2009

Paul Martin Esq
Communities and Local Government
CIL Team
Zone 1/E2 Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU

Dear Mr Martin

NFU/CLA/CAAV/TFA JOINT RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY CONSULTATION – EXEMPTION FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

1. Introduction

This is a joint response by the NFU, CLA, CAAV and TFA to the draft regulations for the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), addressing the particular issue of agricultural development and presenting the case that it should be excluded from the CIL. Each organisation is likely to submit its own response to the draft regulations to address other issues.

1.1 **The National Farmers Union** (NFU) represents over 55,000 farm businesses in England and Wales involving an estimated 155,000 farmers and partners in the business who have an interest in recognising and valuing the benefits of the different services that land provides. In addition, the NFU has over 55,000 countryside members interested in farming and the countryside, including issues such ecosystems services.

1.2 **The Country Land & Business Association (CLA)** represents over 35,000 members in England and Wales. Our members are individuals, businesses, charities, farmers and estate managers, who collectively manage and/or own about half of all rural land; indeed they represent some 260 different types of rural businesses. They generate jobs; provide land and buildings for investment, and housing for local people as well as producing food, fibre and a whole range of land-based environmental services. They also manage and/or own a quarter to a third of *all* heritage, so that the CLA is by far the largest heritage-owner stakeholder group.

1.3 **The Central Association of Agricultural Valuers** (CAAV) represents, briefs and qualifies 2,500 professionals who advise and act on the very varied matters affecting rural and agricultural businesses and property throughout England and Wales. Instructed by a wide range of clients, including farmers, owners, lenders, public authorities, conservation bodies and others, this work requires an understanding of practical issues.

The CAAV does not exist to lobby on behalf of any particular interest but rather, knowing its members will be called on to act or advise both Government and private interests under developing policies, aims to ensure that they are designed in as practical a way as possible, taking account of circumstances.

1.4 **The Tenant Farmers Association** (TFA) was formed in 1981 by a group of tenant farmers who felt that their interests were not being forcefully represented by existing bodies. The TFA is the only organisation dedicated to the agricultural tenanted sector. It provides advice, support and information to its members and lobbies on behalf of members and the tenanted sector.

2. The Issue

2.1 The NFU, CLA, CAAV and TFA propose that agricultural development, as defined in Class III of Schedule 2 to the Buildings Regulations 2000 (SI No. 2531), should be excluded from the Community Infrastructure Levy at a national level.

Such an exclusion would meet the criteria set out by DCLG in paragraph 4.38 of the consultation document in that:

a. The exemption will not create scope for challenge, be difficult to apply or create a loophole, because it will be clear what it applies to.

b. The exemption will be fair and will not create undue distortions of competition; we believe that it will not give rise to an illegal State aid.

c. The exemption will not give rise to other unacceptable distortions to behaviour or create perverse incentives.

d. The exemption will not lead to charging authorities suffering a disproportionate loss of revenue.

In Appendix 1 we have explained more fully why we consider that our proposal meets these criteria.

3. Rationale

3.1 We propose that agricultural development should be exempt from the CIL on the following grounds:

- Enhancement in land values
- Economic viability
- Food production
- Impact on infrastructure

3.2 Enhanced land value

3.2.1 One of the original concepts behind CIL was that part of the uplift in land values associated with the grant of planning permission for development should be used to provide the infrastructure demanded by that development. This is seen in paragraph 1.21 of the consultation document:

> "It is also right that those who benefit financially when planning permission is given should share some of that gain with the community which granted it to help fund the infrastructure that is needed to make development acceptable and sustainable".

3.2.2 Charging authorities are expected to undertake an assessment of land values in their area as part of the process of setting the CIL charge (consultation document, paragraph 3.37). It appears that this is referring mainly to the value of land suitable for housing or commercial development, where it is expected that CIL will be funded by an uplift in land value which will be realised before development commences.

3.2.3 The development of new agricultural buildings differs from this as there is little or no uplift in land value associated with agricultural development; owners and occupiers of farms do not benefit financially when planning permission is granted for agricultural buildings.

3.2.4 The approach taken by professional Agricultural Valuers when preparing valuations of farms is explained by the Central Association of Agricultural Valuers' President, Mark Webb MRICS FAAV, who has been a Fellow of the CAAV and a practising Agricultural Valuer for 25 years:

> "The value added to a farm by a planning consent for the construction of a new agricultural building is usually negligible, amounting in most cases to little more than the cost of making the application. In practice, because a planning consent can lapse if development has not commenced, no value is usually attributed to a consent in a formal valuation.
>
> "If development has commenced, the additional value to the site of the consent and development is normally assessed by reference to the cost of the works completed at the time of the valuation. The new agricultural building might be important to the farm business as a whole, but its value in the open market is likely to be close to or even below the cost of construction. This reflects
>
> a) the low levels of return on investment in agriculture which are generally too low to attract investor interest;
> b) the fact that buildings are generally an integral part of the farm property and cannot be sold separately without significant adverse impact on the remainder of the holding;
> c) the fact that new buildings are generally small in scale compared to the remainder of the holding to which they are attached and consequently their impact on overall value is very limited."

3.2.5 We have been seeking evidence of the sales of farm buildings in order to demonstrate this point and have contacted a number of the larger firms of land agents in the country. None had any evidence of sales of farm buildings in isolation from whole farms, other than the specialist market for poultry buildings.

3.2.6 Smiths Gore, a national firm of Chartered Surveyors and Agricultural Valuers, have analysed the sales of 12 sets of poultry farm buildings, which are sometimes sold as stand-alone units. These buildings cost in the region of £10 per square foot to build at today's prices. The sale prices ranged from £6.82 /sq ft to £0.84/sq ft, including the land on which the buildings were constructed. This demonstrates that these agricultural buildings did not add value to the land and the open market actually values them at less than the cost of construction.

3.3 Economic viability

3.3.1 Article 24 (2)(b) requires the charging authority to have regard to "the potential effects of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development in its area". "Economic viability" is not defined in the Regulations, and there is no suggestion that a formal definition will be made.

3.3.2 As discussed in section 3.1, there is no significant uplift in agricultural land values from the granting of planning permission for agricultural buildings. This means that any assessment of the economic viability of a development after CIL will have to consider the impact of the levy compared to revenues returned from the development.

3.3.3 Unlike other developments, such as building housing, there is not a common purpose for a new building to be built, so there is not a common margin or profit per square metre. Profitability will vary by sector as well as depending on the reason for the investment. A new building may be required to increase output, make efficiency savings or meet new requirements and regulations, each of these will have different impact on profitability. Appendix 2 gives some case studies of agricultural buildings, whilst appendix 3 gives some examples of recent regulations which have led to new buildings being required by some farmers.

3.3.4 Data from the Defra's farm business survey (FBS) gives the profitability of individual units such as a cow or a hectare (see appendix 4). It's clear that any investment which enabled farmers to farm more may well be borderline in terms of its profitability.

3.3.5 Furthermore, FBS data on farm business income (after subsidies) shows the overall economic health of the sectors. It is one question assessing whether or not the development will improve profitability, but another issue on whether the sector has the ability to invest. Income from farming is such that a further levy, on top of all the existing charges over and above the cost of the actual building, would have a major impact on much of the agricultural sector. (see appendix 5 for breakdown of the Farm Business Income)

3.3.6 Further evidence of the lack of investment in buildings is provided by a recent study by consultants Savills for the NFU, "A Sustainable Future for British Chicken", which concluded that returns on investment for poultry farmers give little or no incentive to reinvest. This research led to a survey of poultry buildings which showed that only 8 per cent of poultry housing has been built in the past 10 years and that 60 per cent of broiler houses are over 20 years old. In a sector where technology changes rapidly, this demonstrates a very real lack of activity in investment. The full report can be found on the NFU website at: http://www.nfuonline.com/Documents/Poultry/BROILER%20FINANCIAL%20STUDY_v15%20Main%20Report%20_%20Ex%20Summ%20FINAL.pdf).

3.3.7 Because CIL needs to be paid upfront it is likely to have an even more negative effect on investment by farmers. As discussed above, due to minimal effects of planning permission on land values in agriculture, and also the fact that the permission applied for will be for part of the existing business it is likely that CIL will have to be paid out of revenue. Any increase in revenue (or profit) from the development will only be realised on completion, so to pay the CIL upfront will almost certainly require a loan, on which interest will be payable until the benefits of the building are felt.

3.3.8 Agricultural buildings represent an investment in an ongoing business and most buildings have a limited life span, due in part to on-going technological development and to increasing regulation from both Europe and Westminster. In fact most agricultural buildings are a wasting asset, declining in value over time. In evidence submitted by CAAV members with details of 26 farm building developments over the last five years, the longest expected lifespan for a building was 40 years.

3.3.9 The costs of an authority applying CIL to agricultural buildings are likely to exceed the revenue. There are relatively few agricultural developments per year in comparison to developments for residential, industrial or commercial property and hence a CIL charge would generate a proportionally small amount of income. However, because many agricultural buildings are large in scale, the levy payer would suffer a disproportionately large charge when CIL is calculated on a £ per square metre basis. The average size of building in the 26 examples we have gathered was 585 m^2, meaning that even a relatively modest CIL charge (say £10 per m^2) would add six thousand pounds in cost to the average building in our examples, and much more to those above the average.

3.3.10 Given the low levy values which could be charged per square metre to keep the developments economically viable, combined with the small number of buildings per area which will be built each year, we find it unlikely that any authority would have the inclination to use CIL on agricultural buildings.

3.4 Food production

3.4.1 The food crisis of 2007/8 brought much needed public attention onto the tension that exists between growing demand for food and food production.

3.4.2 With world population increases and higher economic wealth bringing even greater demand, it is important that land and other resources across the world are used as productively as possible. Recent reports from the FAO suggest that 70% more food will be needed by 2050. Much of this production increase will have to be found through existing land and resources meaning that farmers across the world will need to improve their productivity.

3.4.3 This increase in demand for food will be combined with climate change, which will impact on the ability of some parts of the world to respond to demands to produce more. In contrast, the UK is likely to be well placed to capitalise on these climatic changes and may be required to play an even greater role in meeting world food demands in future. However, it is important that the right investments are made in the coming years.

3.4.4 An important part of this investment needs to be used to increase the productivity of assets such as buildings. Many agricultural buildings are outdated, and were not built with modern farming methods and yields in mind. New buildings might be used to produce more chicken for a given amount of man power, reduce the number of deaths in lambing time or simply store more grain enabling the farmer to choose the best price. Any building that increases profitability will mean that there is more money to invest elsewhere on the farm, making UK agriculture more sustainable in the future.

3.4.5 Any increase in tax or an additional levy, such as CIL will impact on marginal investments, meaning that the industry will be less productive and less well prepared for any future shifts in demand.

3.5 Impact on infrastructure

3.5.1 The CIL is intended to pay for the infrastructure requirements of new development and to spread that cost across a greater proportion of development than has previously paid under planning obligations. The demands on infrastructure are expected to be generated principally by housing, as demonstrated by the sub-title on page 18 “Context: the challenge of housing supply and economic prosperity”.

3.5.2 Infrastructure in the context of CIL is to be given a broad interpretation. The consultation documents refer to health centres, police stations and parks being examples of “infrastructure”, as well as the more usual understanding of transport networks and utilities provision.

3.5.3 Most new agricultural buildings are developed within an existing business. In some cases they are developed to allow the business to grow and in other cases they are replacing obsolete structures with more efficient modern buildings. In some cases there may be less impact on infrastructure, such as when a new dairy unit with improved on-site milk storage only requires collection every other day instead of daily. New buildings also tend to result in more efficient surface and foul water disposal systems, reducing demand on water infrastructure. In a very few cases substantially increased output may lead to a marginal increase in traffic. We have assessed the demand on infrastructure which has arisen from our case studies and two typical examples are set out below:

Example 1:
Construction of a sheep shed to house sheep over the winter has the following impact on local infrastructure:

- *Changes in vehicle movements –*

- *sheep are not moved off the farm for the winter, meaning a reduction in vehicle movements to transport and return the stock and to check them;*
- *increase in deliveries of feed and stores, say an extra two or three vehicle movements per year.*

• *Maintaining the viability of an upland farm helps to support the local community by supporting local shops and suppliers.*

Example 2:
Replacement of an obsolete grain store with a modern one has a neutral impact on local infrastructure as the activity on the farm is able to continue as before.

3.5.5 It is our view that agricultural buildings do not make significant demands on infrastructure; indeed with the growing emphasis on food security it could be argued that food production is an important part of the infrastructure of the country.

4. Taxation

4.1 There would appear to be potential taxation liabilities for farmers constructing agricultural buildings if CIL is chargeable. The consultation document at paragraph 4.263 states:

"this means that for developers who incur CIL wholly and exclusively for the purposes of their development trade (but not in relation to a fixed capital asset of trade), CIL payments will be deductible expense when calculating profits for Corporation or Income tax purposes".

4.2 This implies that farmers would not be able to have CIL as a tax deductible expense because they are not carrying out a development trade. This would further increase the financial burden on their businesses, effectively meaning that CIL provides a "double whammy" in taxation terms.

4.3 The NFU requested further information on the taxation implications from DCLG. In his reply of 2nd October, Andrew Masters discussed the CGT issues and confirmed that, having spoken to HMRC, he believed that "CIL payments will not be allowable in computing capital gains."

4.4 This confirms that CIL charges will have to be paid by farmers from net income, with no off-setting against tax to recognise that in these cases, the investment is in existing businesses. This further exacerbates the impact of CIL on these businesses.

5. The Solution

5.1 The consultation document makes it clear that exemptions from CIL should be kept to a minimum and in general we support the aim to spread the cost of infrastructure more widely. However, the proposals have already suggested that CIL will only be charged on "buildings" and that "buildings into which people do not normally go" will be excluded (consultation document, paragraphs 4.6 and 4.7). Reference is made to the definition in the Building Regulations 2000 S.I. No. 2531 and the relevant definition can be found in Schedule 2:

CLASS II
Buildings not frequented by people

A detached building -
(a) into which people do not normally go; or
(b) into which people go only intermittently and then only for the purpose of inspecting or maintaining fixed plant or machinery,
unless any point of such a building is less than one and a half times its height from

(i) any point of a building into which people can or do normally go; or
(ii) the nearest point of the boundary of the curtilage of that building,
whichever is the nearer.

5.2 It would be a logical and appropriate step to extend the exemption from CIL to buildings within Class III of the same Schedule to the Building Regulations:

CLASS III
Greenhouses and agricultural buildings

1. Subject to paragraph 3, a greenhouse.

2. A building used, subject to paragraph 3, for agriculture, or a building principally for the keeping of animals, provided in each case that -
(a) no part of the building is used as a dwelling;
(b) no point of the building is less than one and a half times its height from any point of a building which contains sleeping accommodation; and
(c) the building is provided with a fire exit which is not more than 30 metres from any point in the building.

3. The descriptions of buildings in paragraphs 1 and 2 do not include a greenhouse or a building used for agriculture if the principal purpose for which they are used is retailing, packing or exhibiting.

4. In paragraph 2, "agriculture" includes horticulture, fruit growing, the growing of plants for seed and fish farming.

6. Conclusion

i. It is essential because of the importance of food security it is essential that farmers have the confidence to invest in new buildings.

ii. Agricultural developments place no or in a few cases a very limited extra burden on infrastructure.

iii. The CIL is essentially a levy on the enhanced value of development land. There is no enhanced land value with agricultural development and therefore the CIL would have to be paid from revenue.

iv. As a class any CIL would make all/most agricultural development unviable. In this context it is noted that the Partial Impact assessment has not considered the agricultural industry.

v. Given (iv) it is unlikely that any authority would be keen to apply CIL to agricultural buildings.

vi. Considering the points above, it seems clear that agricultural development as a class should be exempted in the regulations from CIL.

We look forward to discussing these issues with the CIL team in the near future.

Yours sincerely

Kate Russell
Central Association of Agricultural Valuers

Fenella Collins
Senior Planning Adviser
Country Land & Business Association

Ivan Moss
Planning Policy Adviser
National Farmers Union

George Dunn
Chief Executive
Tenant Farmers Association

APPENDIX 1

Criteria for assessing exemptions (see paragraph 4.38 CIL consultation document)

The exemption should not create scope for challenge, be difficult to apply or create a loophole because it is not clear what it applies to.

It is proposed that 'agricultural' development should be exempt from CIL. The definition would be the same as that in the Building regulations 2000 S.I. No. 2531 Schedule 2 Class III. This is a long standing definition well understood both within the planning profession and farming industry.

The exemption should be fair and not create undue distortions of competition in particular, it should not give rise to an illegal State aid

As it is proposed the whole farming industry is exempted, it is both fair and will not create distortions of competition. In our view it is not illegal state aid to take advantage of the exemptions allowed by section 222(1) (c) of the act to exempt agriculture from the CIL. However, even if the exemption was state aid, agricultural is a sector which enjoys sector specific rules on state aid in the following circumstance:

- aids for investments on farms can normally be permitted at up to 40% of eligible expenses, or 50% in the less favoured areas; higher rates of aid may sometimes be allowed for investments linked to the conservation of traditional landscapes, the relocation of farm buildings in the public interest, or to the improvement of the environment, animal welfare or hygiene;
- aids for investments in the processing and marketing of agricultural products will from now on be governed by the provisions applicable to State aid in the industrial sector. The aid intensity, however, will be, in general, higher than for the industrial sector
- aids granted in return for agri-environmental undertakings given by farmers and other environmental aids;
- aids to compensate for handicaps in less favoured areas;
- aids to help the setting-up of young farmers;
- aids for early retirement, the cessation of farming activities, or the closure of production, processing and marketing capacity;
- aids for the establishment of producer groups;
- aids to compensate for damage caused to agricultural production or the means of production caused by natural disasters or exceptional occurrences, adverse weather conditions or outbreaks of animal or plant disease, and aids granted to encourage insurance against such risks;
- aids to encourage the production and marketing of quality agricultural products, the provision of technical support for producers and the improvement of the genetic quality of livestock;
- Natura 2000 payments and payments linked to Directive 2000/60/EC;
- aid for meeting standards;
- aid for the forestry sector.

In addition to these categories of aid, which are specifically covered in the Community Guidelines For State Aid In The Agriculture And Forestry Sector 2007 To 2013 (2006/C 319/01) aid may also be granted in accordance with other Community texts for research and development, for rescue and restructuring farms in difficulty, and to support employment.

The proposed exemption should not give rise to other unacceptable distortions to behaviour or create perverse incentives.

The proposal is for all agricultural developments to be exempt and therefore no distortions will occur.

The exemption should not lead to charging authorities suffering a disproportionate loss of revenue.

The amount of agricultural development as a proportion of total development in any district is very limited. This is particularly true in growth areas where substantial numbers of houses and employment development are proposed. Even if agricultural development is not exempt it will have to have a very low charge rate for the reasons set out above. Therefore any funding raised in a growth area will be tiny. It is even possible that the costs of collecting a CIL from agricultural development may be more than the money raised.

Appendix 2 – Case study examples of agricultural buildings constructed since 2002

	Location	Farm Type	Type of Development	Reason for Development	Size (m^2)	Lifespan (years)	Cost
1	Bucks	Dairy and arable	Grain store	Newly built farmyard needed a grain store	557	30	£130,000
2	Co Durham	Hill sheep	Winter housing	Improvement to over winter stock and assist with lambing	384	35	£80,000
3	Essex	Arable	Grain store and sugar beet store	Old stores were obsolete - too small for current yields and modern equipment.	744	30	£290,000
4	Hants	Stock rearing	Extension to cattle shed	Improvement to over winter cattle	250	40	£34,000
5	Hants	Dairy	Young stock building	Calf housing	140	40	£24,500
6	Hants	Dairy	Cattle shed and muck store	Improvement for dairy herd for animal welfare purposes	1390	40	£230,000
7	Hants	Dairy	Dairy and milking parlour	Improvement to enlarge/modernise	157	40	£20,000
8	Hants	Dairy	Covered yard	Roofed over open yard to cut slurry/dirty water storage	338	40	£20,500
9	Hants	Livestock	New barn	Improvement to over winter stock and assist with lambing	224	40	n/a
10	Kent	Livestock	Cattle sheds, GP buildings	Housing an existing herd and expansion	2467	20	£246,720
11	Kent	Arable / Potatoes	Grain Storage	Replacement building and increase access	1472	30	£147,208
12	Kent	Mixed	Grain Storage	Replace fire damaged building	1340	30	£133,956
13	Kent	Potatoes	Potato Store	Investment in improved facilities	1080	25	£108,000
14	Kent	Livestock	Cattle shed	Expansion of cattle enterprise	828	30	£82,880
15	Kent	Livestock and Hops	Livestock and GP buildings	Replace fire damaged building	788	25	£78,780
16	Kent	Livestock	Cattle shed	Business expanding	432	30	£22,000
17	Kent	Dairy	Covered Silage Clamp	To comply with regulations	420	20	£42,000
18	Kent	Livestock	Livestock and GP buildings	Relocation of farm	322	25	£32,200
19	Kent	Hay Producer	Hay Storage Building	Expand operation	276	25	£27,645
20	Kent	Livestock	Cattle Housing	Insufficient space and fire damage	232	25-30	£23,200
21	Kent	Arable	GP building	Insufficient space	216	25	£21,600
22	Kent	Livestock	GP building	Insufficient tractor storage	216	25	£21,600
23	Kent	Top Fruit	GP building	Insufficient storage	189	25	£18,875
24	Kent	Livestock	Bull Housing	Purpose built to comply with legislation	140	20	£14,000
25	Staffs	Arable	Grain store	Old store did not comply with regulations	334	30	£60,000
26	Staffs	Arable	Straw store	Store required to protect crop and support profitability.	280	40	£22,000

Appendix 3 – Regulations

The appendix below gives some *examples* of where regulations have led to a need for a new building.

The UK livestock industry, will need to continue to invest significantly in new or upgraded buildings not only in order to improve efficiency and to meet market demand but also to meet welfare standards (such as 'Freedom Foods') and to meet various pieces of legislation.

Regulation such as Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (under the Environmental Permitting Regulations), by far in a way the most significant and extensive piece of legislation that has impacted on agriculture, requires that pig and poultry buildings are upgraded to reduce the impact of ammonia emissions on the immediate environment. In some cases, changes will have to be made as soon as October 2011. In other cases, the requirement is for the farm buildings to be upgraded to reduce ammonia emissions by 2020. About a 1000 pig and poultry farms currently fall within the requirements of these regulations.

European Council Directive 1999/74/EC bans the use of conventional egg laying cages from 1st January 2012. In place of these systems producers will have to invest in Enriched Colony laying systems, often requiring new larger buildings, and related infrastructure. The cost of a new build enriched colony laying system is in the region of £30 per bird place. There are currently approximately 16 million laying hens in cages, of which 2 million are already in the enriched colony system. Eggs from the new statutory system, will be labelled as a cage egg, like the conventional cage egg, hence receiving no market premium.

These are direct examples of legislature requiring investment in new buildings and infrastructure, just to allow the businesses to remain in operation, with no direct financial gain or reward.

Appendix 4 – Income per Unit of Production

NET ANNUAL INCOMES: 2009 ORDER

Column 1 Farming Use	Column 2 Unit of Production	Column 3 NAI from Unit of Production
Livestock		
Dairy cows	cow	416.00
Dairy replacements	head	94.00
Beef breeding cows		
LFA	cow	-143.00
non-LFA	cow	-147.00
Beef fattening cattle (semi-intensive)	head	-48.00 (1)
Pigs		
Sows and gilts in pig	sow or gilt	182.00
Porker	head	11.30
Cutter	head	13.70
Bacon	head	15.70
Ewes		
LFA	ewe	-12.00
non-LFA	ewe	-10.00
Store Lambs	head	3.50
Poultry		
Laying hens	bird	3.00
Point of lay pullets	bird	0.60
Broilers	bird	0.30
Christmas turkeys	bird	6.10
Farm arable crops		
Barley	hectare	-29.00
Beans	hectare	-36.00 (2)
Oilseed rape	hectare	9.00
Dried Peas	hectare	-78.00 (2)
Wheat	hectare	42.00
Potatoes	hectare	
First early	hectare	2497.00
Maincrop	hectare	1866.00
Sugar beet	hectare	357.00
Outdoor horticultural crops		
Orchard fruit	hectare	2720.00
Soft fruit	hectare	6830.00

Notes to column 3

(1) This is the figure for animals which would be kept for 12 months.

(2) A sum in respect of the current protein supplement payable should be added to this figure

Appendix 5 - Farm incomes

	Farm Business Income from Agriculture					
	2003/2004	2004/2005	2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	Average
Cereals	£37,730	£14,898	-£29,651	-£14,107	£16,080	£4,990
Dairy	£27,147	£28,201	£13,244	£3,723	£25,403	£19,544
General cropping	£57,931	£32,798	-£5,142	£9,957	£25,778	£24,264
Horticulture	£36,052	£22,042	£22,205	£25,361	£38,528	£28,838
LFA grazing	£6,757	£5,621	-£14,376	-£16,825	-£17,134	-£7,191
Lowland Grazing	£5,526	£3,606	-£11,941	-£12,412	-£12,632	-£5,571
Mixed	£24,112	£16,913	-£12,227	-£13,003	-£2,122	£2,735
Pigs	£31,283	£22,171	£18,311	£11,166	-£511	£16,484
Poultry	£44,866	£80,806	£83,465	£92,413	£127,451	£85,800