



**Federatie Particulier Grondbezit
Dutch Association of Landowners**

- **Survey of Agricultural Structure in the Netherlands**
- **Trends in the rural area**
- **Consequences for the price of land**
- **Impacts for the land owner/user**

Ir. Jan J. Helder, President FPG



FPG

Dutch Association of Landowners

- **2000 members: owners of properties, estates, forests, agricultural farms**
- **Private property: 185.000 ha of which 120.000 ha agricultural use**
- **65.000 ha country estates and forests**
- **25 % of the properties of the members belongs to the Natura 2000 area**

Ir. Jan J. Helder, President FPG



Mission:

- **To further develop the quality, sustainability, and the financial continuity**
- **The development of the private property of the members**
- **With responsibility to the society. cultural history, landscape, bio diversity management etc.**

- **Use of surface in the Netherlands (ca 4 million ha's)**
- **Agriculture 57%**
- **Water surface 18%**
- **Wood and nature 11.2%**
- **Houses, buildings 8%**
- **Traffic, infrastruct. 5.7%**

Agricultural importance

- **More than 85.000 farms of which 1500 > 100 ha. (2003: decline 5% /jr)**
- **turn over food sector: € 40 billion**
- **Employment agri-sector: 600.000**
- **32% of gross added value is produced on 75 % of the land; 38 % is produced on 4 % of the area (horticulture)**
- **40 % of all transport of goods is related to agricultural prod. and agrifood**

Classification of agriculture

| | 1975 | 2000 |
|---------------|-------|-------|
| •Arable | 32 % | 42 % |
| •Grassland | 67 % | 52 % |
| •Horticulture | 5.3 % | 6.1 % |

Land owned and tenanted

| | 1995 | 1999 |
|--------------|------|------|
| •Land owned | 65% | 65% |
| •Tenant land | 35% | 35% |

Tenancy prices per ha/jr (Eur)

| | 1995 | 1997 | 1999 |
|------------------------|------|------|------|
| Land and buildings | 441 | 442 | 519 |
| Land without buildings | 258 | 272 | 306 |

Prices of land per ha in 1000€.

| | 1995 | 1997 | 1999 | 2001 | 2002 |
|-----------------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| •Land with farm | 25.9 | 31.08 | 41.8 | | |
| •Arable land | 18.0 | 31.8 | 30.6 | 37.3 | -- 5% |
| •Grassland | 18.1 | 21.1 | 29.0 | | |
| •Horticulture | 95.7 | 128.1 | 210.4 | | |

Components of landprices

- **Prospective agricultural value**
- **Prospective value after changing the zoning plan (agriculture→buildings, infrastructure)**
- **Increase of the land price in urban areas**
- **The distance to the urban area**
- **Capacity and willingness to pay for neighbours' land**

Cap Reform

- **Production-decoupled support system**
- **Based on individual historical data**
- **Different per product**
- **To deal apart from land**
- **Coupled with cross compliance**
- **To cream of the premium in favour of development the country side**

Effects of the Mid Term Review on the price of land

- Selling apart from land: ↓
- 2013: quota system and income support † : ↓
- Decreasing of the price for quota: ↓
- Fiscal treatment; is the premium right a property right or a income right? ↑↓
- Decoupling negative effect on milkprice
- (-20-30 %): ↓
- Restrictions in cultivation (only market EU-regulation products):
- Conclusion: MTR reduces the price of land

Society

- **Country side is public area**
- **People think individual, going from self-interest and not from professionalism and expertise**
- **Political translation of individual thinking is a risk for a sustainable management of the country side**

Assessment for the country side is related to place and period

- **After WW II:**
 - Food supply is most important
 - From society: reciprocal respect and appreciation to farmers,
 - People lives sober, works very hard and has a few of facilities
- **Actual:**
 - Country side is an open space for rest, nature and landscape
 - A place for recreation, culture, history and bio diversity
 - Food supply is not longer the first an issue

Conclusion: living in the country side is attractive; increasing effect on price of land

Multifunctional use of land

- **Society asks development of the landscape**
- **Lack of money**
- **Solutions:**
 - **development and management by private owners“**
 - **Red or Blue for Green constructions”**
 - **New economic carriers (recreation facilities, local products and so on**
 - **Public Private colaboration**

The Governments' policy

An agricultural society at three levels

- A competitive agriculture, producing for the free/world markets
- Agriculture with new economic carriers
- With premiums supported agriculture in areas with handicaps