

KEY POINTS FROM EVIDENCE FROM LACHLAN GRANT

Asked to consider

- 1.1. I have been asked to assess the application relative to the NPS for Highly Productive Land.

Correction from original evidence

- 1.2. Any 'offsetting' needed for retaining potential productive capacity can only be undertaken on remaining land areas that are not classified as highly productive land.

Summary of Evidence

- 1.3. The proposed subdivision area is all classified as class 3 land (LUC unit 3w1) and consequently is subject to the NPS-HPL. The Applicant's Planning Assessment states that the proposed subdivision satisfies the criteria in clause 3.8(1) of the NPS-HPL and is therefore enabled, however the Goodman Report states there will be a loss of 4.5% in production as a result of the subdivision. Clause 3.8(1)(a) of the NPS-HPL requires the overall productive capacity of the site to be retained. A loss does not achieve this.

Review of Goodman's Second Report

- 1.4. The Goodman's second report looks at demonstrating that the overall capacity and productive potential is retained over time through drainage and intensification of other areas of highly productive land. This needs to occur on areas of non-highly productive land rather than on areas of highly productive land. Hence the Applicant has not demonstrated that clause 3.8(1)(a) has been satisfied.

Review of Tither Report

- 1.5. The Tither report shows that the capacity and productive potential is not retained through Farmax modelling by looking at gross farm income and kilograms of meat and fibre.

Conclusion

- 1.6. The applicant has not demonstrated that they can offset their lost potential productive capacity on the remaining areas of non HPL.

Lachlan Grant