

APPENDIX XXV.

REPORT FROM VALUER-GENERAL *re* C. C. GRAHAM.

The Chairman, Valuation of Land Commission, Wellington.

MR. C. C. GRAHAM and his two daughters are the lessees of a Crown pastoral run situated in Vincent County. The aggregate area of the property held is 101,250 acres, the unimproved value of which is £6,380, or 1s. per acre, the Crown's interest therein being £5,395, and the interest of the lessees £985.

The unimproved value of the runs is based on the estimated average carrying-capacity of the country, allowing for the altitude, average climatic conditions, average lambing percentages, and average death-rate and value of a sheep. The country in question is only fit for merino sheep, consequently the return from the property is confined to the wool-value. It is assumed, however, that the country is worked by settlers who have special knowledge of pastoral farming and high country, for this is indispensable to successful farming. I could quote cases where through bad judgment and neglect a whole flock has been wiped out in one night by a snowstorm.

I understand that Mr. Graham does not work the property himself, but employs a manager.

Prior to the passing of the Rating Amendment Act, 1910, the definition of rateable value of pastoral runs was the annual rental value capitalized at 6 per cent. This definition was repealed in 1910. (See rating Amendment Act, 1910, section 22.)

I presume that Mr. Graham bases his objection to value on the fact of increased rates, he being responsible for the rates payable on the Crown's interest as well as his own.

In valuing the whole of the high pastoral country in Otago and Canterbury, consequent upon the passing of the Rating Amendment Act, 1910, to which I have referred, a great deal of time and trouble was taken by the Department in order to ensure that the valuations in all cases were fair. A few objections were lodged against the proposed values, but in every case the Department proved that it had underestimated rather than overestimated the value of the runs.

F. W. FLANAGAN, Valuer-General.

Valuation Department, Wellington, 4th February, 1915.

APPENDIX XXVI.

LETTER FROM VALUER-GENERAL *re* MR. McKEAGG.

SIR,—

Valuation Department, Wellington, 2nd February, 1915.

I arranged with Mr. McKeagg that Mr. District Valuer Atkinson would inspect his property at Mosgie, and report to me as to whether a concession could reasonably be made to Mr. McKeagg without doing injustice to the owners of adjoining lands in the Borough of Mosgiel. Mr. McKeagg understands the position. The point of dispute between him and the Department is precisely that submitted for the judgment of the Supreme Court of Wellington during the present month—namely, the correct interpretation of section 32 of the Valuation of Land Act, 1908.

I have, &c.,

F. W. FLANAGAN, Valuer-General.

The Chairman, Valuation of Land Commission, Wellington.

DECISION OF COMMISSION.

No further action.

3/2/15.

APPENDIX XXVII.

REPORT FROM VALUER-GENERAL *re* J. McKECHNIE, DUNEDIN.

The Chairman, Valuation of Land Commission, Wellington.

MRS. McKECHNIE's property was formerly portion of the Chapman Estate, situated in Stuart Street, Dunedin, and was purchased by the former at auction on the 24th June, 1910.

When the Department was informed of the purchase the existing roll values of the original property was apportioned in accordance with the method in force under the Valuation of Land Act, 1908, and the apportionments were duly made on the district valuation roll.

The values assigned to Mrs. McKechnie's property were: Unimproved value, £1,000; value of improvements, £2,100: making a capital value of £3,100.

Mr. McKechnie objected to this apportionment on the 30th September, 1911. On the 29th of the same month the Officer in Charge, Dunedin, informed him by memorandum that he could apply for a revaluation under section 36 of the Valuation of Land Act, 1908, on payment of a fee of £2 2s. Mr. McKechnie was also informed on this date that a reduction of £100 had been made in the value of his improvements.

Mr. McKechnie again wrote the Officer in Charge on the 29th January, 1912, asking him if it was the intention of the Department to revalue that part of the city in which Mrs. McKechnie's land was situated.