

**Local Government
Remuneration Tribunal**

Annual Determination

Report and determination
under sections 239 and 241 of the
Local Government Act 1993

17 April 2025

Contents

Executive Summary	3
Categories	3
Fees	3
Section 1 – Introduction	4
Background	4
Section 2 – 2024 Determination	5
2024 Annual Determination	5
Section 3 – 2025 Review	6
2025 Annual Review process	6
Submissions Received – Remuneration Structure	18
Section 4 – 2025 Fees	23
Submissions – 2025 Fees	23
Conclusion	28
Section 5 – Determinations	29
Determination No. 1 – Allocation of councils into each of the categories as per section 239 of the LG Act effective 1 July 2025	29
Determination No. 2 - Fees for Councillors and Mayors as per section 241 of the LG Act effective from 1 July 2025	33
Appendices	36
Appendix 1 Criteria that apply to categories	36

Executive Summary

The *Local Government Act 1993* (LG Act) requires the Local Government Remuneration Tribunal (the Tribunal) to report to the Minister for Local Government by 1 May each year on its determination of categories of councils and the maximum and minimum amounts of fees to be paid to mayors, councillors, as well as chairpersons and members of county councils.

Categories

Section 239 of the LG Act requires the Tribunal to determine the categories of councils and mayoral offices at least once every 3 years. A review of categories was last carried out by the Tribunal in 2023.

The Tribunal will next consider the model, the criteria for each group, and the allocation of councils in the 2026 review.

The criteria for each category is published in Appendix 1 of the Determination and remains unchanged from 2023.

It should be noted that **the Tribunal determined that one Council - Mid Coast Council – would be re-categorised from a Regional Centre to Regional Strategic Area from 1 July 2025** as a result of meeting the criteria at Appendix 1.

Fees

The Tribunal has determined a **3%** per annum increase in the minimum and maximum fees applicable to each category from **1 July 2025**.

Section 1 – Introduction

Background

1. Section 239 of the LG Act requires the Tribunal to determine the categories of councils and mayoral offices at least once every 3 years. The Tribunal last undertook a comprehensive review of the categories and the allocation of councils into each of those categories in 2023.
2. The Tribunal will next conduct a full review of the categories and the allocation of councils as required by the LG Act in the 2026 Annual Review.
3. Section 241 of the LG Act provides that the Tribunal determine the minimum and maximum amount of fees to be paid to mayors and councillors of councils, as well as chairpersons and members of county councils for each of the categories determined under s.239.
4. The Tribunal can also determine that a council be re-categorised into a different category, existing or new, with a higher range of fees.
5. The Tribunal's Annual Determination takes effect from 1 July each year.

Section 2 – 2024 Determination

2024 Annual Determination

6. In 2024, the Tribunal received 19 written submissions, which included two requests for re-categorisation.
7. The Tribunal found that the current allocation of the councils remained appropriate, with the exceptions outlined below.
8. The Tribunal closely reviewed population and data relating to council operations in the 2024 Annual Determination process to ensure categorisation of councils was consistent with the criteria.
9. For reasons explained at paragraphs 35-39 of the Local Government Annual Determination 2024, Hilltops Council and Muswellbrook Shire Council were reclassified as Regional Rural Councils.
10. The Tribunal determined that fees would increase by 3.75% for the minimum and maximum fees applicable to each category from 1 July 2024.

Section 3 – 2025 Review

2025 Annual Review process

11. The Tribunal's 2025 Annual Review commenced in October 2024, when it wrote to all councils inviting submissions regarding fees. The Tribunal noted that it is only required to review the categories every three years and will next consider the model, the criteria applicable to each category and the allocation of councils in the 2026 Annual Review.
12. The invitation noted that it is expected that submissions are endorsed by respective councils.
13. The Tribunal also wrote to the President of Local Government NSW (LGNSW) inviting a submission.
14. The Tribunal received 16 written submissions from individual councils and one submission from LGNSW.
15. The Tribunal acknowledges and thanks all parties for their submissions.

Submissions Received – Requests for Re-categorisation

16. Seven of the 16 council submissions received requested re-categorisation or changes to current category criteria.
17. LGNSW also advocated for changes to factors affecting categorisation of councils.
18. Berrigan, City of Parramatta, Gilgandra Shire, Lake Macquarie City, City of Ryde, City of Sydney and Blacktown put forward cases for re-

categorisation, or changes to category criteria, and the creation of new categories, for the Tribunal's consideration.

Requests for Re-classification

19. **Berrigan Shire Council** requested re-categorisation from Rural to Rural Large, despite acknowledging that they do not meet all the benchmarks in the criteria for this category.
20. The criteria for Rural Large is outlined at Appendix 1 of the 2024 Annual Determination, page 38 which states:

“Councils categorised as Rural Large will have a residential population greater than 10,000, and a councillor to resident ratio of at least 1 to 1200.

Other features may include:

- *one or two significant townships combined with a considerable dispersed population spread over a large area and a long distance from a major regional centre*
- *a limited range of services, facilities and employment opportunities compared to Regional Rural councils*
- *local economies based on agricultural/resource industries.”*

21. Council's submission states they are currently at 86% of the population target threshold and 90% of the representation ratio but are meeting other criteria benchmarks.
22. Given that Council does not currently satisfy the population and ratio thresholds specified for Rural Large, the Tribunal is not persuaded to include Berrigan Shire Council in Rural Large at this time.
23. **City of Parramatta Council** requested that it be re-categorised to the highest category of general purpose councils, Principal CBD, in order to recognise its size, rate of growth, economic and global influence, operational budget, and strategic and geographical importance.
24. Council put forward a similar case for re-categorisation as part of the 2024 annual determination process, which was unsuccessful. In addition to the reasons put forth in paragraph 20 of the 2024 annual determination, the Council has included the following reasons for its re-categorisation request:
 - A local economy that has more than 30% of Australia's top 500 companies with offices in Parramatta, and estimated public and private investments in the next 5 years of \$20 billion
 - It is estimated by 2050 that Parramatta will be a city with a population of more than 500,000 people
 - The expected accessibility of the City, being a 'gateway to Sydney' with more people expected to live west of Parramatta than to its

east by 2050, and being accessible by 2.3 million people within 45 minutes

- Key infrastructure in Parramatta, including but not limited to the Parramatta PHIVE, CommBank Stadium, the new Parramatta Light Rail, the Westmead Institute for Medical Research, Sydney Olympic Park and construction of Powerhouse Parramatta
- Expansion of education and innovation precincts, with Parramatta's education and training sector being valued at \$1.6 billion, and
- Significant operating and capital works budget of \$607 million, including multiple town centres, and sports and cultural hubs.

25. The Council also argues that a re-classification would reflect the additional skills and abilities that representing a growth council requires.
26. The City of Parramatta notes that the number of electors that each councillor represents is higher than the City of Sydney's. The submission states that the elected councillors represent more than 125,000 enrolled electors, compared to City of Sydney's elected councillors representing 45,891 enrolled electors.
27. Parramatta was classified as a Major CBD, following the 2017 Annual Determination. The Tribunal had found that Parramatta Council was significantly different from other large metropolitan councils on the basis of its secondary CBD status, as recognised by the State Government, at paragraph 21 of the 2017 annual determination. As a result, the

description of Major CBD has remained specific to the City of Parramatta. Similarly, the Principal CBD criteria remained specific to the City of Sydney, since its inception in 2017.

28. Given the specific nature of both Major CBD and Principal CBD categories, the City of Parramatta's request for re-categorisation will require a change in the categories' criteria. As stated above, the Tribunal is not considering the criteria applicable to each category in the 2025 Annual Review process. The Tribunal will next consider the categories and criteria as part of the 2026 Annual Review process.
29. **Gilgandra Shire Council's** submission requests that it be re-categorised from Rural to Rural Large. Gilgandra Shire Council's case to be included in Rural Large category is based on two main points. The first point being Council offers a diverse range of services, and secondly these services result in higher levels of accountability and responsibilities for councillors.
30. Council submits it offers a diverse range of services over and above traditional local government services, which includes being the primary service provider for the community in the aged care and disability services. These include:
 - Age care and disabilities services
 - Meals on wheels and community transport
 - Home care package delivery
 - Operation of a villa retirement village
 - Indigenous specific residential age care facility

- Residential aged care nursing home
 - Supported employment service for adults with intellectual disabilities
 - Special disability accommodation properties for adults with intellectual disabilities
 - Supported Living Services through the National Disability Insurance Scheme, and
 - Day activities centre to support clients with unique challenges.
31. The submission notes these services not only entail a higher level of accountability and responsibility from Council (due to changes in the regulatory environment) but also generate larger revenue and employment opportunities that is comparable to a Rural Large category.
32. Council further submits that when assessing categories to place councils in, the Tribunal should also give due consideration to other factors than those outlined in the s.240 of the LG Act, such as services provided; financial responsibility; scale of operation; and number of employees.
33. While the Tribunal notes Council's request, it does not satisfy the population and ratio thresholds specified for the category of Rural Large. Further, the changes to criteria suggested would require a change in categories, which is not being considered this year. For these reasons, the Tribunal is not persuaded to include Gilgandra Shire Council in Rural Large at this time.

34. Similar to last year, **Lake Macquarie City Council** requested that it be re-categorised from Regional Strategic Area to Major Strategic Area. Council also advocated for the population threshold of Regional Strategic Area be adjusted from its current threshold of 300,000 down to 200,000.
35. Council argues that its population, scale and output of council operations is significantly greater than other councils categorised as Regional Strategic Area, and more aligns with the Central Coast, as the council classified as a 'Major Strategic Area'.
36. Lake Macquarie City Council's request for re-categorisation is based on the following:
 - Lake Macquarie being the second largest non-metropolitan council by population in NSW, with a larger population than Newcastle and Wollongong, which are classified as Major Regional Cities.
 - A population density that is 'significantly larger' than other Regional Strategic Areas and supported by 5 precincts in the Lake Macquarie LGA that have been identified for inclusion in the NSW Government Transport Oriented Development Program, which aims to encourage housing development near transport hubs, and are argued to lead to population growth near the hubs; and
 - A Gross Regional Product that is comparable to those of Major Strategic Areas and Major Regional City, rather than other Regional Strategic Areas.

37. Council provided population data to support its case for the population threshold of Regional Strategic Area to be adjusted from its current threshold of 300,000 down to 200,000. The data was also provided as justification for its claim of a 'significant disparity within the Regional Strategic Area category' between Lake Macquarie and other councils:
- Lake Macquarie: 219,249 residents, 24,769 non-residents
 - Shoalhaven: 108,895 residents, 4,632 non-residents
 - Tweed: 98,967 residents, 7,755 non-residents
 - Maitland: 95,958 residents, 15,305 non-residents
38. As stated in paragraph 28 of the 2024 Annual Determination, all categories were determined by extensive evidence examined and considered by the Tribunal. It was determined that the population threshold for the Major Strategic Area was appropriate. As a result, the Tribunal is currently not persuaded to modify the criteria for the Major Strategic Area.
39. **City of Ryde Council** provided a submission requesting it be re-classified from its existing category of Metropolitan Large to Metropolitan Major. Council's case to be re-classified includes:
- The LGA having an area of 40.651 km², 16 suburbs, 3 wards, a population of 135,000 residents and over 54,000 rateable properties within its boundaries
 - A local economy that consists of 92,000 local jobs, 14,300 businesses and a gross regional product of \$19.2 billion

- An innovation district within its west ward that has a long history of investment from all tiers of government, ultimately contributing \$13.6 billion annually to the NSW economy
 - Future growth opportunities linked to the Governments Transport Oriented Development Accelerated Precincts, which Macquarie Park is identified as, that will bring increased housing, amenities and job retention, and
 - Plans to build 2 new schools, 11,600 new homes, the redevelopment of Ryde Hospital and bringing together a range of organisations to create a fully integrated academic health sciences centre at Macquarie University Hospital.
40. As stated in Council's own submission, currently it does not satisfy the population threshold criteria required for Metropolitan Major. Accordingly, the Tribunal is not persuaded at this time to include City of Ryde in the category of Metropolitan Major.
41. The Tribunal also notes **Wollondilly Council's** submission confirming its adopted position to remain classified as a Regional Centre.
42. The Tribunal acknowledges each of the Council's requests for re-categorisation. Whilst the Tribunal has not been persuaded at this time to grant these requests, any council that provides a submission in the 2026 annual review, which includes a request for re-categorisation, will of course be considered.

Requests for New Classifications

43. The **City of Sydney** Council requested the Tribunal change the classification name from Principal CBD to the previously used term “Principal City”.
44. The category “Principal City” was last used in the 2016 Determination. It was changed to Principal CBD in 2017 as a result of a review of categories. This review was undertaken in the context of Local Government reform, and council amalgamations, reducing the number of councils from 152 to 128.
45. Council’s submission outlines the history of boundary changes, including its expansion of the City of Sydney as a consideration in reverting to the 2016 category name.
46. Sydney City Council contends that reverting to the category term “Principal City” recognises that the council’s significance and contribution extends beyond the Sydney CBD.
47. The Tribunal notes the City of Sydney’s request would constitute modification to the category of “Principal CBD”. As stated above, the category “Principal CBD” is specific to City of Sydney and the Tribunal is not considering changes to the criteria applicable to each category in the 2025 Annual Review.
48. **Blacktown Council** requested re-categorisation from its current category of Metropolitan Major to a newly created category of “Metropolitan Major – High Growth”.

49. Council's case to be re-categorised to a newly created category is based on the following:
- Council asserts that it is the largest and one of the fastest growing local government areas in NSW, and
 - It undertakes several transformational projects, including projects funded from NSW Government and Western Sydney Infrastructure Grants.
50. Further, Council submits that the category of Metropolitan Major fails to account for the transformational nature of projects undertaken by Council, including the economic and strategic impacts for NSW, and impact on its local government area (LGA), which results in attracting new residents and people to the LGA.
51. The Tribunal notes that a new category, Metropolitan Major, was introduced in 2023, to address generally the issues raised in the current submission.
52. As explained in the Tribunal's letter inviting submissions, the Tribunal is required to review the categories at least once every three years. The Tribunal will next consider the model, the criteria applicable to each category and the allocation of councils in the 2026 Annual Review process.
53. As such, the Tribunal is not persuaded at this time to create a new category.

54. **LGNSW** submitted that the Tribunal should, as part of its determination for the categorisation of councils, consider the demographic and economic shifts impacting the complexity of council operations, and the communities that councils serve.
55. The LGNSW submission provides examples of recent demographic shifts the Tribunal should consider, as factors affecting categorisation of councils, including:
- The NSW Government's Transport Oriented Development Program, where the resulting accelerated growth drastically increases demands on the strategic and infrastructure planning functions of councils affected
 - The Renewable Energy Zones, which drive tens of billions of dollars of investment in rural and regional LGAs, and creates additional impacts in said councils, including population growth and growing infrastructure for transport and utilities, or
 - The Renewable Energy Planning Framework, which includes benefit sharing guidelines for councils to ensure their communities share the benefits of the project and require additional responsibility and management from affected councils.
56. Section 240 of the LG Act notes that the Tribunal is to determine categories for councils and mayoral offices according to prescribed matters. One such matter is the 'nature and extent of the development of areas', which could reasonably be accepted to include the items listed by LGNSW.

57. However, this matter would also require a change to the categories' criteria, in order to identify areas of high development. As stated above, the Tribunal is not considering any modifications to the categories as part of the 2025 Annual Review process. However, the Tribunal will consider proposed modifications to categories as part of the 2026 Annual Review process.

Reclassification due to population thresholds

58. As was the case last year, the Tribunal reviewed applicable data as part of this review, to determine if any councils have met relevant benchmarks, therefore requiring a move in category.
59. The Tribunal identified that **Mid-Coast Council** met the population benchmark to be considered a Regional Strategic Area. As a result, Mid-Coast Council will be classified as a Regional Strategic Area in the 2025 Annual Determination.
60. The Tribunal will continue to monitor and review applicable data to ensure categorisation of councils remain consistent with the current criteria.

Submissions Received – Remuneration Structure

61. The current state of the remuneration structure continues to be a key issue of concern raised in submissions. A significant number of submissions received provide commentary on the structure, including examples of how it could be improved. These are addressed in the points below.

Fees for Deputy Mayors

- 62. The issue of fees for deputy mayors was once again raised.
- 63. Three submissions asserted that the position of deputy mayor should attract its own distinct independent fee, beyond the fee provided for in s.249(5) of the LG Act.
- 64. The Tribunal dealt with this issue in its 2024 Annual Determination at paragraph 53-55. It was noted that the Tribunal lacked the powers to implement changes to the fee structure that would include a distinct independent fee for the position of deputy mayor.
- 65. There has been no change to the legislation to permit such a change. Therefore, the Tribunal is currently unable to introduce a remuneration structure that would include a distinct independent fee for the position of deputy mayor.

Changes to the role of Mayors and Councillors

- 66. It was suggested that the current remuneration structure is not fit for purpose as it no longer recognises the roles and responsibilities required of councillors and mayors.
- 67. Multiple submissions, including the LGNSW's submission, highlighted how the role of the councillor and mayor have changed over the past 9 years. Submissions identified a variety of factors that have impacted the roles of councillors and mayors, including the impact of NSW Government

priorities and investments, and amendments to the LG Act (e.g. via the *Local Government Amendment (Governance and Planning) Bill 2016*).

68. It has been suggested that these changes have impacted the volume, nature and workload of the role, whilst remuneration has not been increased accordingly.
69. The recent submissions to the Tribunal, along with its own observations, highlight that the role of mayor in civic leadership, advocacy and representation has become more complex and demanding – an issue that must be addressed.
70. Community expectations are increasing on the mayor from both the council and the community to be seen and immediately present during times of natural disasters, major events or crisis.
71. Additionally, the disparity in the council categorisation between the annual fees for councillors and the mayor needs to be more consistent, so as not to be seen to be devaluing the role of mayor in some circumstances.
72. The Tribunal is not suggesting a fundamental review of the role of mayors and notes that people that enter local government representation do so from a sense of civic service, rather than remuneration.
73. However, the Tribunal has a statutory function, and not unlike the governing body of a council, mayors and councillors, its role, responsibility and functions are clear. The same can be said in relation to the clear functions of the general manager of a council.

74. As previously stated, many of the matters raised in both council and LGNSW submissions are beyond the remit of the Tribunal, and to a degree, were addressed in the 2023 determination.

Regional and Rural mayors and councillors

75. Several submissions, including LGNSW, also raised concerns regarding the inadequacy of the remuneration structure, for rural and regional councils.
76. Specifically, that the remuneration provided to regional and rural councillors does not reflect the significant stressors that regional and rural councils in NSW face and that consideration should be given to the additional demands placed on mayors and councillors in rural and regional councils.
77. One submission suggested that fees for rural councils should be commensurate with fees for regional and metropolitan councils – arguing that mayors and councillors, regardless of their location, are required to possess a wide range of skills and knowledge.

Fees set by councils

78. Submissions received by the Tribunal regarding the current state of the remuneration framework raised concerns about councils setting their own fees, asserting that it could potentially be seen as a conflict of interest.

79. It was suggested that a possible solution would be for the Tribunal to determine a fixed annual fee for mayors and councillors.
80. Whilst the Tribunal acknowledges and understands the concern raised, as explained in the 2024 Annual Determination at paragraph 68-69, such a change to the framework, to determine a fixed annual fee for mayors and councillors, would require legislative change.
81. As there has been no changes to the legislative scheme, it is not within the Tribunal's remit to determine a fixed annual fee for mayor and councillors' remuneration.

Request for a Review of the Remuneration Structure

82. For the reasons outlined above, several submissions suggested the Tribunal undertake a comprehensive review of the framework.
83. One submission went so far as to request the Tribunal recommend to the Minister for Local Government that a comprehensive review of the framework and LG Act be undertaken. Others suggested the Tribunal actively seek a referral from the Minister to undertake such a review.
84. The LG Act does not specify that the Tribunal is able to carry out a comprehensive review of the framework. As such, it is not within the Tribunal's remit to undertake such a review, unless such a function is conferred or imposed on it by the Minister, as per s.238(2) of the LG Act.
85. Should such a function be conferred on the Tribunal, it will of course carry out its functions and undertake a review.

Section 4 – 2025 Fees

Submissions – 2025 Fees

86. LGNSW's submission to the Tribunal advocated for an increase in the minimum and maximum fees payable to mayors and councillors of at least 4%, to:

- Assist in reversing the fee erosion which occurred under the previous NSW Public Sector Wages Policy
- Mitigate economic pressures and the rising cost of living
- Ensure councillors and mayors receive fair and reasonable remuneration for the work they perform, and
- Address historic undervaluation of the work performed by elected representative in local government in NSW.

87. Economic data provided to the Tribunal by LGNSW to support their claim for an increase of at least 4% included:

- An annual Consumer Price Index (CPI) increase of 3.8% for the 12 months to June 2024
- The Fair Work Commission (FWC) awarding a 3.75% increase to the minimum pay for modern awards, and increasing the national minimum wage to \$915.90, as well as the FWC's comments regarding the growing cost of living and deterioration of disposable income, and
- The rate peg for the 2025-26 financial year being between 3.6%-5.1%.

88. LGNSW also noted that the annual wage review, state wage case, award increases and the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal all had a clear theme on the increasing financial pressures on councils and its officers, which warrant increases in revenue and wages.
89. During its meeting with the Tribunal and assessors, LGNSW asserted that the current fees paid to mayors and councillors do not reflect their responsibilities. Nor do the current level of fees contribute to attracting a diverse range of candidates to stand for local government elections.
90. LGNSW also raised the issue of superannuation. It was contended that the payment of superannuation be mandated. Current arrangements require that a council pass a resolution at an open meeting to make such payments.
91. Four submissions received from individual councils directly addressed the issue of quantum increase to the minimum and maximum fees. These submissions sought an increase ranging from 3% to 10%.
92. The City of Sydney Council notes in its submission that it was not seeking an increase in fees payable for the Lord Mayor of Sydney.
93. The Tribunal is empowered under the s.241 of the LG Act to set minimum and maximum fees payable. It is then up to council to fix payment of annual fees for the mayor as outlined in s.249 of the LG Act.
94. It was suggested that the current fees, particularly in rural and remote communities, do not recognise or value the role of mayor and councillor,

with fees set at a level that is commensurate to unqualified or inexperienced personnel.

95. The Tribunal was provided with a number of examples to demonstrate the financial impact, by way of lost wages, under the current fee rates.
96. Furthermore, 4 submissions compared the remuneration for NSW mayors and councillors with mayors and councillors in Victoria and Queensland as well as state Members of Parliament. The figures were provided to the Tribunal to demonstrate that the remuneration for NSW mayors and councillors is lower than all comparison examples provided.
97. It was also asserted that the low level of fees set for mayors and councillors devalues the importance and responsibility of the roles, diminishing the work undertaken on behalf of the community and is a significant barrier as to why people do not run for council.

“If councillors were paid a full-time wage I would have run again. Nothing surer.”

98. Another submission suggested that fees need to reflect the part-time or full-time nature of the work carried out by mayors and councillors. The setting of fees at such a rate would appropriately recognise and value this important work, whilst also mitigating any financial loss incurred by those members of the community elected to carry out these critical functions.
99. Nine submissions supported an increase, whilst not making a direct comment on the quantum. Other submissions advocated for remuneration to be set at a level that:

- Is in line with responsibilities and challenges councillors' face
- Reflects the public profile and exposure of the role
- Reflects the growing complexity of the role
- Reduces the gap between minimum and maximum fees for each category
- Accounts for the rising cost of living challenges
- Reflects the commitment, accountability, workload, skills and knowledge required to perform the role of councillor and mayor regardless of location
- Establishes and maintains parity with mayors and councillors in other States and Territories
- Is 'determined outside of council so as councillors are not determining their own payments', and
- Overcomes economic barriers that prevent diverse members of the community from participating as a mayor or councillor.

Fee Increase

100. The Tribunal considered a range of factors in determining the amount to increase minimum and maximum fees payable to councillors and mayors. This included a wide range of economic data such as:

- Consumer Price Index for the 12 months to December each year
- Wage Price Index for the 12 months to December each year

- Full-time average weekly ordinary time earnings for the 12 months to November each year
- NSW Public Sector Salaries increases
- Local Government State Award increases
- IPART Rate Peg Base Cost Change
- Public Service Senior Executive remuneration determinations, by the Statutory and Other Offices Remuneration Tribunal, and
- State Members of Parliament Basic Salary remuneration determinations by the Parliamentary Remuneration Tribunal.

101. On this occasion the Tribunal has determined that a **3%** increase will apply to the minimum and maximum fees applicable to existing categories.

Conclusion

102. The Tribunal's determination has been made with the assistance of the Assessors, Ms Kylie Yates and Mr Brett Whitworth.
103. Determination 1 sets out the allocation of councils into each of the categories as per s.239 of the LG Act.
104. Determination 2 sets out the minimum and maximum fees paid to councillors and mayors and chairpersons of county councils as per s.241 of the LG Act.
105. The Tribunal acknowledges and thanks the Remuneration Tribunal secretariat for its excellent research and support to facilitate the successful completion the 2025 Annual Determination.



Viv May PSM

Local Government Remuneration Tribunal

Dated 17 April 2025

Section 5 – Determinations

Determination No. 1 – Allocation of councils into each of the categories as per section 239 of the LG Act effective 1 July 2025

General Purpose Councils – Metropolitan

Principal CBD (1)

- Sydney

Major CBD (1)

- Parramatta

Metropolitan Major (2)

- Blacktown
- Canterbury-Bankstown

Metropolitan Large (10)

- Bayside
- Cumberland
- Fairfield
- Inner West
- Liverpool
- Northern Beaches
- Penrith
- Ryde
- Sutherland

- The Hills

Metropolitan Medium (8)

- Campbelltown
- Camden
- Georges River
- Hornsby
- Ku-ring-gai
- North Sydney
- Randwick
- Willoughby

Metropolitan Small (8)

- Burwood
- Canada Bay
- Hunters Hill
- Lane Cove
- Mosman
- Strathfield
- Waverley
- Woollahra

General Purpose Councils - Non-Metropolitan

Major Regional City (2)

- Newcastle
- Wollongong

Major Strategic Area (1)

- Central Coast

Regional Centre (22)

- Albury
- Armidale
- Ballina
- Bathurst
- Blue Mountains
- Byron
- Cessnock
- Clarence Valley
- Coffs Harbour
- Dubbo
- Eurobodella

Regional Strategic Area(5)

- Lake Macquarie
- Maitland
- Mid-Coast
- Shoalhaven
- Tweed
- Hawkesbury
- Lismore
- Orange
- Port Macquarie-Hastings
- Port Stephens
- Queanbeyan-Palerang
- Shellharbour
- Tamworth
- Wagga Wagga
- Wingecarribee
- Wollondilly

Regional Rural (14)

- Bega
- Broken Hill
- Goulburn Mulwaree
- Griffith
- Hilltops
- Kempsey
- Kiama
- Lithgow
- Mid-Western
- Muswellbrook
- Nambucca
- Richmond Valleys
- Singleton
- Snowy Monaro

Rural Large (16)

- Bellingen
- Cabonne
- Cootamundra-Gundagai
- Cowra
- Federation
- Greater Hume
- Gunnedah
- Inverell
- Leeton
- Moree Plains
- Murray River
- Narrabri
- Parkes
- Snowy Valleys
- Upper Hunter
- Yass

Rural (38)

- Balranald
- Berrigan
- Bland
- Blayney
- Bogan
- Bourke
- Brewarrina
- Carrathool
- Central Darling
- Cobar
- Coolamon
- Coonamble
- Dungog
- Edward River

- Forbes
- Gilgandra
- Glen Innes Severn
- Gwydir
- Hay
- Junee
- Kyogle
- Lachlan
- Liverpool Plains
- Lockhart
- Murrumbidgee
- Narrandera
- Narromine
- Oberon
- Temora
- Tenterfield
- Upper Lachlan
- Uralla
- Walcha
- Walgett
- Warren
- Warrumbungle
- Weddin
- Wentworth

County Councils

Water (4)

- Central Tablelands
- Goldenfields Water
- Riverina Water
- Rous

Other (6)

- Castlereagh-Macquarie
- Central Murray
- Hawkesbury River
- New England Tablelands
- Upper Hunter
- Upper Macquarie

Determination No. 2 - Fees for Councillors and Mayors as per section 241 of the LG Act effective from 1 July 2025

The annual fees to be paid in each of the categories to Councillors, Mayors, Members, and Chairpersons of County Councils effective on and from 1 July 2024 as per section 241 of the *Local Government Act 1993* are determined as follows:

Table 4: Fees for General Purpose and County Councils

General Purpose Councils – Metropolitan

Councillor/Member Annual Fee (\$) effective 1 July 2025

Category	Minimum	Maximum
Principal CBD	31,640	46,420
Major CBD	21,120	39,100
Metropolitan Major	21,120	36,970
Metropolitan Large	21,120	34,820
Metropolitan Medium	15,830	29,550
Metropolitan Small	10,530	23,220

Mayor/Chairperson Additional Fee* (\$) effective 1 July 2025

Category	Minimum	Maximum
Principal CBD	193,650	254,810
Major CBD	44,840	126,320
Metropolitan Major	44,840	114,300
Metropolitan Large	44,840	101,470

Metropolitan Medium	33,630	78,480
Metropolitan Small	22,420	50,650

General Purpose Councils - Non-Metropolitan

Councillor/Member Annual Fee (\$) effective 1 July 2025

Category	Minimum	Maximum
Major Regional City	21,120	36,690
Major Strategic Area	21,120	36,690
Regional Strategic Area	21,120	34,820
Regional Centre	15,830	27,860
Regional Rural	10,530	23,220
Rural Large	10,530	18,890
Rural	10,530	13,930

Mayor/Chairperson Additional Fee* (\$) effective 1 July 2025

Category	Minimum	Maximum
Major Regional City	44,840	114,300
Major Strategic Area	44,840	114,300
Regional Strategic Area	44,840	101,470
Regional Centre	32,940	68,800
Regional Rural	22,420	50,680
Rural Large	16,820	40,530
Rural	11,210	30,390

County Councils

Councillor/Member Annual Fee (\$) effective 1 July 2025

Category	Minimum	Maximum
Water	2,090	11,620
Other	2,090	6,930

Mayor/Chairperson Additional Fee* (\$) effective 1 July 2025

Category	Minimum	Maximum
Water	4,490	19,080
Other	4,490	12,670

*This fee must be paid in addition to the fee paid to the Mayor/Chairperson as a Councillor/Member (s.249(2)).



Viv May PSM

Local Government Remuneration Tribunal

Dated: 17 April 2025

Appendices

Appendix 1 Criteria that apply to categories

Principal CBD

The Council of the City of Sydney (the City of Sydney) is the principal central business district (CBD) in the Sydney Metropolitan area. The City of Sydney is home to Sydney's primary commercial office district with the largest concentration of businesses and retailers in Sydney. The City of Sydney's sphere of economic influence is the greatest of any local government area in Australia.

The CBD is also host to some of the city's most significant transport infrastructure including Central Station, Circular Quay and International Overseas Passenger Terminal. Sydney is recognised globally with its iconic harbour setting and the City of Sydney is host to the city's historical, cultural and ceremonial precincts. The City of Sydney attracts significant visitor numbers and is home to 60 per cent of metropolitan Sydney's hotels.

The role of Lord Mayor of the City of Sydney has significant prominence reflecting the CBD's importance as home to the country's major business centres and public facilities of state and national importance. The Lord Mayor's responsibilities in developing and maintaining relationships with stakeholders, including other councils, state and federal governments, community and business groups, and the media are considered greater than other mayoral roles in NSW.

Major CBD

The Council of the City of Parramatta (City of Parramatta) is the economic capital of Greater Western Sydney and the geographic and demographic centre of Greater Sydney. Parramatta is the second largest economy in NSW (after Sydney CBD) and the sixth largest in Australia.

As a secondary CBD to metropolitan Sydney the Parramatta local government area is a major provider of business and government services with a significant number of organisations relocating their head offices to Parramatta. Public administration and safety have been a growth sector for Parramatta as the State Government has promoted a policy of moving government agencies westward to support economic development beyond the Sydney CBD.

The City of Parramatta provides a broad range of regional services across the Sydney Metropolitan area with a significant transport hub and hospital and educational facilities. The City of Parramatta is home to the Westmead Health and Medical Research precinct which represents the largest concentration of hospital and health services in Australia, servicing Western Sydney and providing other specialised services for the rest of NSW.

The City of Parramatta is also home to a significant number of cultural and sporting facilities (including Sydney Olympic Park) which draw significant domestic and international visitors to the region.

Metropolitan Major

Councils categorised Metropolitan Major will typically have a minimum residential population of 400,000.

Councils may also be categorised Metropolitan Major if their residential population combined with their non-resident working population exceeds 400,000. To satisfy this criteria the non-resident working population must exceed 50,000.

Other features may include:

- total operating revenue exceeding \$300M per annum
- the provision of significant regional services to greater Sydney including, but not limited to, major education, health, retail, sports, other recreation and cultural facilities
- significant industrial, commercial and residential centres and development corridors
- high population growth.

Councils categorised as Metropolitan Major will have a sphere of economic influence and provide regional services considered to be greater than those of other metropolitan councils.

Metropolitan Large

Councils categorised as Metropolitan Large will typically have a minimum residential population of 200,000.

Councils may also be categorised as Metropolitan Large if their residential population combined with their non-resident working population exceeds 200,000. To satisfy this criteria the non-resident working population must exceed 50,000.

Other features may include:

- total operating revenue exceeding \$200M per annum
- the provision of significant regional services to greater Sydney including, but not limited to, major education, health, retail, sports, other recreation and cultural facilities
- significant industrial, commercial and residential centres and development corridors
- high population growth.

Councils categorised as Metropolitan Large will have a sphere of economic influence and provide regional services considered to be greater than those of other metropolitan councils.

Metropolitan Medium

Councils categorised as Metropolitan Medium will typically have a minimum residential population of 100,000.

Councils may also be categorised as Metropolitan Medium if their residential population combined with their non-resident working population exceeds 100,000. To satisfy this criteria the non-resident working population must exceed 50,000.

Other features may include:

- total operating revenue exceeding \$100M per annum
- services to greater Sydney including, but not limited to, major education, health, retail, sports, other recreation and cultural facilities
- industrial, commercial and residential centres and development corridors
- high population growth.

The sphere of economic influence, the scale of council operations and the extent of regional servicing would be below that of Metropolitan Large councils.

Metropolitan Small

Councils categorised as Metropolitan Small will typically have a residential population less than 100,000.

Other features which distinguish them from other metropolitan councils include:

- total operating revenue less than \$150M per annum.

While these councils may include some of the facilities and characteristics of both Metropolitan Large and Metropolitan Medium councils the overall sphere of economic influence, the scale of council operations and the extent of regional servicing would be below that of Metropolitan Medium councils.

Major Regional City

Newcastle City Council and Wollongong City Councils are categorised as Major Regional City. These councils:

- are metropolitan in nature with major residential, commercial and industrial areas
- typically host government departments, major tertiary education and health facilities and incorporate high density commercial and residential development

- provide a full range of higher order services and activities along with arts, culture, recreation, sporting and entertainment facilities to service the wider community and broader region
- have significant transport and freight infrastructure servicing international markets, the capital city and regional areas
- have significant natural and man-made assets to support diverse economic activity, trade and future investment
- typically contain ventures which have a broader State and national focus which impact upon the operations of the council.

Major Strategic Area

Councils categorised as Major Strategic Area will have a minimum population of 300,000. To satisfy this criteria the non-resident working population can be included.

Other features may include:

- health services, tertiary education services and major regional airports which service the surrounding and wider regional community
- a full range of high-order services including business, office and retail uses with arts, culture, recreation and entertainment centres
- total operating revenue exceeding \$250M per annum

- significant visitor numbers to established tourism ventures and major events that attract state and national attention
- a proximity to Sydney which generates economic opportunities.

Currently, only Central Coast Council meets the criteria to be categorised as a Major Strategic Area. Its population, predicted population growth, and scale of the Council's operations warrant that it be differentiated from other non-metropolitan councils. Central Coast Council is also a significant contributor to the regional economy associated with proximity to and connections with Sydney and the Hunter Region.

Regional Strategic Area

Councils categorised as Regional Strategic Area are differentiated from councils in the Regional Centre category on the basis of their significant population and will typically have a residential population above 100,000. To satisfy this criteria the non-resident working population can be included.

Other features may include:

- health services, tertiary education services and major regional airports which service the surrounding and wider regional community
- a full range of high-order services including business, office and retail uses with arts, culture, recreation and entertainment centres
- total operating revenue exceeding \$250M per annum

- significant visitor numbers to established tourism ventures and major events that attract state and national attention
- a proximity to Sydney which generates economic opportunities.

Currently, only Lake Macquarie Council meets the criteria to be categorised as a Regional Strategic Area. Its population and overall scale of council operations will be greater than Regional Centre councils.

Regional Centre

Councils categorised as Regional Centre will typically have a minimum residential population of 40,000. To satisfy this criteria the non-resident working population can be included.

Other features may include:

- a large city or town providing a significant proportion of the region's housing and employment
- health services, tertiary education services and major regional airports which service the surrounding and wider regional community
- a full range of high-order services including business, office and retail uses with arts, culture, recreation and entertainment centres
- total operating revenue exceeding \$100M per annum
- the highest rates of population growth in regional NSW

- significant visitor numbers to established tourism ventures and major events that attract state and national attention
- a proximity to Sydney which generates economic opportunities.

Councils in the category of Regional Centre are often considered the geographic centre of the region providing services to their immediate and wider catchment communities.

Regional Rural

Councils categorised as Regional Rural will typically have a minimum residential population of 20,000. To satisfy this criteria the non-resident working population can be included.

Other features may include:

- a large urban population existing alongside a traditional farming sector, and are surrounded by smaller towns and villages
- health services, tertiary education services and regional airports which service a regional community
- a broad range of industries including agricultural, educational, health, professional, government and retail services
- large visitor numbers to established tourism ventures and events.

Councils in the category of Regional Rural provide a degree of regional servicing below that of a Regional Centre.

Rural Large

Councils categorised as Rural Large will have a residential population greater than 10,000, and a councillor to resident ratio of at least 1 to 1200.

Other features may include:

- one or two significant townships combined with a considerable dispersed population spread over a large area and a long distance from a major regional centre
- a limited range of services, facilities and employment opportunities compared to Regional Rural councils
- local economies based on agricultural/resource industries.

Rural

Councils categorised as Rural will typically have a residential population less than 10,000.

County Councils - Water

County councils that provide water and/or sewerage functions with a joint approach in planning and installing large water reticulation and sewerage systems.

County Councils - Other

County councils that administer, control and eradicate declared noxious weeds as a specified Local Control Authority under the Biosecurity Act 2015.