

**REPORT**

**and**

**DETERMINATIONS**

**Of**

**THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT REMUNERATION**

**TRIBUNAL**

**Under**

**SECTIONS 239 AND 241**

**of the**

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1993**

**29 April 2002**

**REPORT:**

Pursuant to Section 241 of the Local Government Act 1993 (the 1993 Act), the Local Government Remuneration Tribunal hereby determines the maximum and minimum amounts of fees to be paid during the period 1 July 2002 to 30 June 2003 for categories of councils, county councils and mayoral offices and reports to the Minister in relation to such determinations in accordance with Section 244(1).

As in previous years, the Tribunal invited submissions on the matters relevant to the Tribunal's statutory functions. The Tribunal received a total of 23 written submissions, of which six were supplemented by oral evidence.

The Tribunal's role, pursuant to section 239 is at least every three years to:

- (1)
  - (a) *determine categories for councils and mayoral offices, and*
  - (b) *place each council and mayoral office into one of the categories it has determined.*
- (2) *The determination of categories by the Remuneration Tribunal is for the purpose of enabling the Remuneration Tribunal to determine the maximum and minimum amounts of fees to be paid to mayors and councillors in each of the categories so determined.*

The variation in the value of the tasks performed by councils is catered for by the determination of minimum and maximum fees for each category. A discretion is granted to individual councils to determine within these parameters their own fees based on their particular circumstances.

As has become established practice, the Local Government and Shires Associations of N.S.W (the Associations) have presented what has been termed a general case for the determination of fees for all categories. As in previous years, it has repeated its claim that the fees determined by the Tribunal should be linked to salaries of Members of Parliament.

Such claims have been made on numerous occasions previously in one form or another. The Tribunal has responded to these claims and in its 1997 Report outlined its reasons for rejecting such a comparison (cf. 1997 Report pp.6-7; p.12 and pp.22-23). The Tribunal's view remains unchanged.

The current fees structure makes allowance for variations of individual councils and provides ambit for councils to determine an appropriate fee based on their individual situation within its category, for example, the number of councillors varies from seven to 15 as does the type, scope and volume of activity. The new fees structure is a significant departure from that of the Local Government Act 1919, which provided for a common fee for all councils. If the Parliament had intended to relate fees for mayors and councillors to parliamentary salaries, then it would have legislated accordingly. Such an arrangement is not without precedent. The Tribunal notes that section 4 of the *Parliamentary Remuneration Act 1989*, provides that the salary of a NSW Member of Parliament is the same as the salary for a Federal Member of Parliament , less \$500.

The comparison of the fees paid in Queensland and New Zealand was made by the Associations in 1995 and discussed by the Tribunal in the 1995 report. Nothing has been submitted on this occasion to cause the Tribunal to alter its findings in the 1995 report (pages 56 to 63).

Another matter was raised by individual councils, namely, the method of electing mayors. The great majority of mayors are elected by councils each year. However, in accordance with Section 282(a) of the Act some councils adopt the procedure of the election of the mayor by the electors for the four-year term of office. It was submitted that this form of election supported the contention that such a mayoral role was a full-time salaried occupation. The Tribunal is unable to accept that the electoral procedure in any way creates a difference in the role of the mayor such as to warrant full-time attendance at the council or that such method of election distinguishes the functions of the mayor from those mayors elected by councils.

What is common to both annually elected and four-year elected mayors in Section 249 of the 1993 Act;

*"A council must pay the mayor an annual fee in addition to the fee paid as a councillor."*

It is not possible for this power to be translated into a power to fix an annual salary for the mayor. For example, Section 248 prescribes

*"A council must pay each councillor an annual fee."*

This applies equally to four-year elected mayors. It is also necessary to observe that fees are fixed by the Tribunal in the light of Section 252, which authorises the payment by councils for incurred expenses and the provision of facilities.

### **Categories**

The Tribunal is required by Section 239 to determine categories of councils at least once every three years. It has been prepared to consider individual cases of councils where significant changes have occurred such as to warrant recategorisation. However, the Tribunal appreciates the action taken by many councils, as a matter of procedure, to keep the Tribunal informed on an annual basis of their activities so that proper consideration can be given to the scale of fees for each category on an annual basis.

It needs to be appreciated that the minimum and maximum fees for categories overlap. Accordingly, some councils when adopting the maximum fee will receive a fee higher than councils in the next category which are paying fees at the lower end of their scale. The Tribunal does not have the power to direct individual councils as to the fee they should adopt.

A submission has again been raised that unless fees are increased,

*"This will not attract the best field of candidates unless the remuneration is upgraded significantly."*

The Tribunal does not accept this proposition. The Tribunal is satisfied that the primary reason most candidates still nominate for office is their primary interest in local government and not remuneration. Historically, persons offered for election to local government for no fee. In 1963 fees were introduced for the first time. They were the same for all councillors and no additional fees were paid to mayors. Since 1993 there have been significant increases in the fees determined for councillors and mayors.

There is no issue that mayors can, if they wish, devote their full time to council operations. The majority do not and are engaged in other employment as are the great majority of councillors. Such representation is invaluable in bringing individual expertise and current knowledge of working life experience to dealing with local problems, ratepayers and council staff in the planning and performance of council activities.

However, the method of performance and the amount of time devoted to local government is largely within the discretion of candidates for office. In nominating for the office of mayor, councillors must be aware of the extra time involved in the performance of such office and would not be expected to nominate if it interfered unduly with their normal occupations. Over a long period of time councils have managed to conduct their affairs by adjusting procedures and programmes to meet the particular circumstances of their councillors.

Because of the large number of councils and the statutory requirement to place councils in categories for the purpose of fixing annual fees for each category, general characteristics were articulated in 1995 for each category. It was recognised that within such common characteristics each council had unique features which impacted upon its operations. It is only when such distinction renders its functions to fall within another category that the Tribunal deals with recategorisation.

With 172 councils and 20 county councils in New South Wales the Tribunal receives many submissions for consideration detailing changes which have occurred in the preceding year. This information is important for the Tribunal to assess in considering whether the fees for each category should be changed. The Tribunal's determinations are public documents and the reports of the determinations outline in broad terms the reasoning adopted by the Tribunal in making such determinations.

### **Category 1**

Written submissions were received from Gosford, Hornsby, Liverpool, Parramatta, Penrith, Randwick and Sutherland. These were supplemented by oral submissions from Gosford, Liverpool and Parramatta. At the invitation of the mayor, an inspection was made of the Parramatta district. All sought recategorisation.

Category 1 is constituted of the large councils in the Sydney metropolitan area which have borne a significant brunt of the increasing urban population with the difficult task of absorbing the multicultural impact of the rapidly changing population mix. The achievement of a population of more than 280,000 by Blacktown within such a task influenced the Tribunal to create a new category with the opportunity given to other category 1 councils to apply for consideration for this category on the basis of some significant distinguishing feature from other councils in category 1.

The Tribunal has given special attention to each of the category 1 councils. For the reasons given below, the Tribunal has decided at this stage that only Penrith warrants inclusion in the new category 1A and Parramatta be included in category S2. Gosford, Hornsby, Liverpool, Sutherland and Randwick certainly warrant payment of the maximum fee for category 1 and their activities have been taken into account in determining the maximum fee for category 1.

The rationale for category S2 was based largely on the regional role of Newcastle and Wollongong over two centuries. A brief resume of such role is set out in the 1995 report (pages 41 to 43). The regional significance of Parramatta has re-emerged due in large part to its development as the major CBD outside the Sydney CBD.

It is to be remembered that Parramatta was the first viable European settlement in Australia and still holds a significant place in the history of Australia with its sites of cultural heritage. The blending of the restoration and preservation of major heritage buildings and sites has to be considered with the rapid growth of its CBD and the demands to meet business and public services requirements.

On the details provided by the council the Tribunal accepts that arising from the current and future developments occurring in this area it can be described as Sydney's second CBD. The large investments at its centre, in association with the preservation and restoration of its heritage buildings and restoration of old industrial sites, has recreated major planning problems.

Parramatta provides a wide variety of services and facilities both private and public for some 1.8 million residents of the Greater Western Sydney Region. It has become the regional focus of commerce, recreation, entertainment, government, transport and community services. To reinforce this the Tribunal notes that on 10 April 2002, the Treasurer, the Hon Michael Egan MLC, informed the Legislative Council that two of the Government's biggest Information Technology (IT) projects had been relocated to Parramatta.

The Treasurer noted that Western Sydney has the highest concentration of Australian owned IT companies in Australia with some 1500 IT companies generating \$2.7 billion a year.

In its region Parramatta is the major office market. In 2001 the council approved applications for developments exceeding \$670 million including New South Wales Police and Sydney Water headquarters as part of the decentralisation of public service and legal activities. The largest individual development will be Civic Place with investment of more than \$500 million expected to create some 7,000 jobs. This will involve the redevelopment of Parramatta Railway Station and the development of the Parramatta Transport Interchange as the hub of the 95-kilometre Western Sydney Transitway network.

The proposed development arises from present intense use of the railway precinct. The number of people travelling to work in Parramatta is 85,000 per day on the latest estimates available. In addition with non work trips to Parramatta daily more than 120,000 people travel to Parramatta CBD each day. It has been estimated that 350,000 people visit Westfield Shopping Town Parramatta per seven-day week. Parramatta is also a major industrial centre and approved \$33 million of industrial development in the year to September 2001. A view of the council's four areas indicates the complexity of the problems considered by the council apart from the CBD area.

The Tribunal has decided that Parramatta has established a case to be categorised as S2.

Since the last visit of the Tribunal to Penrith the growth of the city has continued in its role as part of outer western Sydney. The council has an important regional role. It is the principal centre of the area covered by the local government areas of Penrith, Hawkesbury and the Blue Mountains. The unique position of Penrith is that it is the first significant point of metropolitan contact from Central Western New South Wales. It is anticipated that Penrith will continue to grow to about 200,000 in the next 10 years depending on the ebb and flow of urban development projects.

The Tribunal accepts the submission of Penrith that its strategic links to western New South Wales and its proximity to one of the most sensitive natural environmental areas, the Blue Mountains, as well as the Nepean/Hawkesbury river system generate challenges resulting from urban growth pressures that the majority of other councils do not experience to the same degree.

The regional role in the context of a wide range of activities has been detailed in Penrith's submission and demonstrated to the Tribunal. The submission is an impressive documentation of the problems of the region and the council's plans and policies to make the area a better place to live with the provision of essential, sporting and recreation facilities available not only to residents in the council area but to those in adjoining areas.



Penrith has consolidated its position as the principal centre of the area covered by the local government areas of Penrith, Hawkesbury and Blue Mountains. As to its regional status, its facilities embrace the University of Western Sydney, the Western Sydney Institute of TAFE, the Wentworth Area Health Service and Nepean Hospital, retailing complexes including Penrith Plaza and Major Bulky Goods Precinct and government services and offices, significant entertainment and recreation facilities and other cultural facilities. It shares with the Blue Mountains and Hawkesbury councils the physical and cultural and now international recognition of the Blue Mountains and the Nepean Valley.

Penrith LGA contains a significant part of the Sydney metropolitan fringe area and has contributed significantly to accommodating the housing demands of Sydney as have other western councils with the attendant problems of managing the effects of urban growth in the particular environment of the river and mountain barriers west of Sydney. While accepting its regional significance, it is no longer separate from the rest of Sydney and much of its development derives from its part of Sydney.

The Tribunal accepts the contention that there is an increasing trend towards regionalisation in outer western Sydney and that Penrith is playing a leading role in regional planning and services in meeting the needs of western Sydney in association with its local role in providing local government services in its area.

Accordingly, it is proposed to include Penrith in category 1A because of its regional significance in outer western Sydney in addition to its category 1 functions.

Gosford seeks recategorisation to category S2 based upon the additional responsibilities of councillors in carrying out council business because of the water and sewerage operations undertaken by the council.

The council has previously sought recategorisation to category S2. On this occasion it has again drawn the attention of the Tribunal to its previous submissions concerning its area, population and environment and its close proximity to Sydney and Newcastle. It was concerned to emphasise its significant involvement as a separate water and sewerage authority. These operations had been taken into account in

assessing its category placement. It does not consider that Gosford meets the category S2 requirements.

Sutherland has sought recategorisation to category 1A rather than again pressing for category S2. The reasons for distinguishing Sutherland from Newcastle and Wollongong by the Tribunal are set out in the 2001 report. The council also stated in its submission:

*“Council does not object to Hurstville being added as a category 1 council. However, it further highlights the disparity between councils at the lower end of this category in terms of size and scale of business, population, budget and range of issues. Whilst the Tribunal may argue that it can be catered for in the scale of fees there is nothing that prevents the smallest councils in the category applying the maximum fee.”*

This comment asserts a matter which has been discussed in previous reports of the Tribunal. There is no statutory power granted to the Tribunal to determine fees for individual councils. The legislation granted councils the discretion to determine their own fees within the limits determined by the Tribunal. It is reasonable for the Tribunal to assume that responsible councils will act in accordance with the intention of the 1993 Act.

The basis for 1A categorisation is stated in the 2001 Report. The Tribunal does not agree with the submission by Sutherland that it complies with such basis although it has satisfied the requirements of the maximum fee for category 1.

Hornsby and Randwick have drawn the Tribunal's attention to the changes and expansion which have continued in the past year and the increased workload associated with such changes. This descriptive material of councils' activities provides the Tribunal with data enabling it to make informed decisions as to the relativity of councils in each category and, indeed, between categories.

Liverpool was categorised as category 1 in large part because of the planning and subsequent operation of the Badgerys Creek airport.

*"In addition, Liverpool's economy will receive a massive stimulus from the construction of the International airport at Badgery's Creek which will create commercial, employment and tourism opportunities. Major road and rail connections will be built to service the airport. A new southern railway line between Glenfield and Badgery's Creek and \$200 million national highway will enhance Liverpool's importance as a business and residential centre. Substantial demands have been placed upon the council to plan for the projected increase in magnitude and diversity of activity in the Liverpool region. This will require consideration of additional strategic and operational planning policies."*

While this plan has not eventuated the council has experienced the impact of significant population growth of some 50,000 in the last decade, a population which is culturally diverse with more than 30 per cent born overseas. Associated with this growth has been the construction of 2000 new dwellings each year over the past five years with associated commercial development. There has also been recent infrastructure developments to cope for the increased population. A number of major strategies are being developed.

In applying for category 1A the Council concedes that it does not meet the primary requirement of a population in excess of 250,000. The Tribunal is not satisfied that the nature and volume of business and its other activities distinguish it from other councils of category 1 at this stage. It may well have been different if the airport proposal had been effected. However, the Tribunal will be prepared to accept a further application within the next three years.

## **Category 2**

Submissions were received from Ashfield, Canada Bay, Canterbury, Kogarah, Manly, Rockdale and Ryde. Of these councils, apart from claims for increased fees, specific claims were made in the following cases.

Canada Bay requested the Tribunal

*"...to recognise the special circumstances related to amalgamated councils and the increased workload in bringing the communities together."*

The Tribunal notes the submission from Canada Bay council that the amalgamation of the former Drummoyne and Concord councils has resulted in a reduction in the number of councillors and, as a result, they carry an increased workload.

The number of councillors is not a matter for the Tribunal to determine. This is a matter for each Council within the provisions of section 224 of the 1993 Act. As to the issue of workload, the fee range is intended to reflect the variations in workload of different councils.

Canterbury, Kogarah, Manly, Rockdale and Ryde seek recategorisation to category 1. After careful consideration of the submissions, both written and oral, the Tribunal has decided that Ryde satisfies the requirements of category 1 and has been recategorised accordingly.

Ryde is situated 12 kilometres west of the Sydney Harbour Bridge. It is bounded by the Parramatta and Lane Cove rivers so that access to the city of Sydney has always been an important issue. Trains, buses and ferries provide transport into and through the area. Victoria, Lane Cove and Epping roads connect the area with other parts of Greater Sydney in addition to very high volumes of through traffic.

The council has regional significance because of the size and growth of the area known as North Ryde or Macquarie Park industrial areas. This is a major employment centre comprising research and development institutions, multinational corporations, small- to medium-size enterprises and Macquarie University. The area developed rapidly over the last 30 years from market gardens and open paddocks to a major employment centre, including Macquarie University and Macquarie Shopping Centre.

The growth in the area included an increase in the value of developments from \$64 million in 1996 to \$737 million in 2001. With 350,000 square metres of office space (43 buildings), Macquarie Park has the fourth largest concentration of office space in the metropolitan area (behind the CBD, North Sydney and Parramatta). There is still large development potential.

The rail link proposes three new stations in the area which will provide a further impetus for development in the Macquarie Park area. The council is participating with Planning New South Wales in the preparation of strategic plans and transport management and accessibility plans to guide the future development.

In addition to the Macquarie Shopping Centre, other regional shopping centres are established at Top Ryde, West Ryde, Gladesville and Eastwood. These centres draw customers from Hunters Hill, Hornsby, Parramatta and Canada Bay.

Adult education is delivered principally through Macquarie University, the Ryde College of TAFE and Meadowbank Centre of TAFE.

The Tribunal is satisfied that Ryde is an area of growing regional significance with a large influx of workers, shoppers and students each day and displays similar category features as Hurstville, Willoughby and North Sydney.

### **Category 3**

Submissions were received from Blue Mountains, Dubbo, Hawkesbury and Queanbeyan. These were supplemented by oral submissions from Blue Mountains and Queanbeyan.

In the case of Blue Mountains and Hawkesbury it has been difficult to categorise them because of their unique features in the Blue Mountains/Hawkesbury area. They both have a population of a category 2 council but the population is spread over a number of towns, villages and rural locations. There is no evident control hub from which to deliver services, which creates difficulties in providing common services and amenities. Furthermore, Sydney's suburban development has expanded, particularly to the Blue Mountains, where 52 per cent of residents commute to outside the local government area for their work. The commuter belt has extended to the mid-Mountains as stated by Blue Mountains. Although a relatively homogenous community in terms of language compared with other local government areas, the Blue Mountains is richly diverse in the interests and lifestyles of its population.

As detailed by Blue Mountains, the four identifiable community areas raise significant differences in priorities. The council claimed that;

*"...this diversity of interests and priorities places particular demands on councillors to balance the often competing needs/wants within the limited budget available".*

In similar fashion, the Hawkesbury area incorporates 60 per cent of its land area as national parks. The alluvial floodplains are predominantly utilised for agricultural and horticultural purposes and the towns and villages contend with the pressures for further development.

Although the type of population is different, the diversity of interests of the population and their requirements differ, the problem of this unique spread of population and its requirements are similar in regard to planning and services.

Hawkesbury operates without a ward structure no doubt because of the diversity of interests of the towns, villages and rural locations. The similar spread of interests in the Blue Mountains is managed under a ward system.

The location of both councils on the fringe of the rapidly growing population of Sydney makes the government of these councils particularly important. The recent bushfire crisis in the area indicates the need for attention to the future development as part of Greater Sydney. The Tribunal considers that neither council falls clearly within category 2 or category 3, nor is it possible to clearly define a separate category to compensate for their different features. For example, Blue Mountains is distinguishable by its urbanisation in the lower Mountains adjacent to Penrith and Hawkesbury adjoins the large growing councils of Penrith, Blacktown, Baulkham Hills, Hornsby and Gosford.

In all the circumstances, the Tribunal does not propose to alter the categories of these councils at this time but will have regard to their activities in the context of re-examining category 3 councils in the next Report.

The Mayor of Queanbeyan Council has not sought recategorisation but a general increase in fees for mayors and councillors to recognise the role of mayors and the responsibilities of councillors.

Dubbo's submission was directed mainly to the position of mayor, who had difficulties in performing the functions of the mayor in addition to his full-time private employment.

The Tribunal cannot determine fees for individual mayors and councillors because of individual workloads. It determines fees for categories in relation to both councillors and mayors based on the provisions of the 1993 Act. The fees determined are for all councillors and mayors in the category and the maximum fees take into account the best performing mayors and councillors. The performance of the mayoral duties in Dubbo has been taken into account in assessing the maximum fee for category 3.

#### **Categories 4 and 5**

The submissions received for categories 4 and 5 were from Gundagai, Pristine Waters and Yallaroi.

Gundagai, as in previous years, maintained its view that councils should be able to set the minimum fee at zero. This submission has been considered in previous reports and the Tribunal does not propose to change its decision.

Pristine Waters, upon the amalgamation of two small rural councils adjacent to Grafton, sought recategorisation in 2001. The Tribunal delayed making a decision until the amalgamated council was in a position to support its claim. The basis for new category status depends upon a comparison of the activities of the new council with the councils of category 4. The comments made by the Tribunal concerning Canada Bay apply to this council.

Yallaroi now seeks not recategorisation but a minimum of \$12,000 per annum for the mayor. The reasons for the increase are claims that the work level of the mayor of this council varies little from that of a large council. Mayors attend the same meetings on

behalf of the community and there is a similar involvement within the local community in carrying out civic duties.

In brief, this submission seems to be based on the proposition that all mayors should receive the same fee, which was the case under the 1919 Act. There was no mayoral fee but a common councillor fee for councillors and mayors. The 1993 Act however, as previously discussed by the Tribunal in its reports, expressly provided for the payment of fees dependent upon categories determined by the Tribunal in accordance with Section 240. Accordingly, the Tribunal does not propose to adopt the Yallaroi claims.

### **North Coast Water**

North Coast Water is the business name for what was previously termed Lower Clarence County Council. The change was to recognise the expanding regional functions of the water supply authority.

North Coast Water's area of responsibility embraces a growing region of New South Wales from Yamba/Iluka in the north to Coffs Harbour/Sawtell in the south including Grafton and Maclean. The region caters for more than 90,000 people. This population is expected to double over the next 25 years.

The stage of planning has been reached whereby construction of the regional project should commence this year. The Copmanhurst water supply component has already started and North Coast Water will have additional consumers later this year. The \$120 million regional project is stated to be one of the largest in New South Wales. North Coast Water is also undertaking the upgrading of existing infrastructure to secure future needs and is seeking to obtain the transfer of water supply and sewerage assets from Pristine Waters Council.

The Tribunal considered the categorisation of the Lower Clarence County Council in 2001 and decided that the council was relevantly placed in category S4. It was stated that;



*"...the activities of this county council are not comparable with category 4 and category 5 councils but its activities will be taken into account in determining the maximum fee in category S4".*

The Tribunal has decided to increase the maximum fees for category S4 to equate with those of category 5.

For the 2003 review the Tribunal intends to examine more closely the regional development of category 3 councils. The Tribunal will be seeking information from these councils on developments since the last major review in 1995.

### **Fees**

Each annual review by the Tribunal is determined in the framework of the economic circumstances of the time. In 2001, the Tribunal increased all minimum and maximum fees for Councils by approximately 7 per cent for Councillors and 10 per cent for Mayors. The trend, as noted in the 2001 report, indicates that some economic adjustment is warranted to recognise the increasing responsibilities placed upon councillors and mayors over the previous 12 months. These changes are assessed taking into account national economic indicators such as the inflation rate and the Wage Cost Index. These changes constitute a proper basis for the adjustment on this occasion for the fees for all categories.

After taking into account the views of the assessors, the Tribunal hereby increases all maximum and minimum fees by 3 per cent including those fees which have been individually reassessed.

### **Local Government Remuneration Tribunal**

(The Honourable Charles L Cullen QC)

Dated: 29 April 2002

**DETERMINATION OF CATEGORIES OF COUNCILS AND COUNTY  
COUNCILS FOR 2001/2002**

<b>Category S1 (1 Council)</b>	Sydney
<b>Category S2 (3 Councils)</b>	Newcastle Parramatta Wollongong
<b>Category S3</b>	County Councils
<b>Category S4</b>	County Councils (engaged in significant commercial activities)

**Category 1A (2 Councils)**

Blacktown  
Penrith

**Category 1. (17 Councils)**

Bankstown	North Sydney
Baulkham Hills	Randwick
Campbelltown	Ryde
Fairfield	South Sydney
Gosford	Sutherland
Hornsby	Warringah
Hurstville	Willoughby
Lake Macquarie	Wyong
Liverpool	

**Category 2. (21 Councils)**

Ashfield	Lane Cove
Auburn	Leichhardt
Botany	Manly
Burwood	Marrickville
Camden	Mosman
Canada Bay	Pittwater
Canterbury	Rockdale
Holroyd	Strathfield
Hunters Hill	Waverley
Kogarah	Woollahra
Ku ring Gai	

**Category 3. (32 Councils)**

Albury	Griffith
Armidale Dumaresq	Hastings
Ballina	Hawkesbury
Bathurst	Kempsey
Bega Valley	Lismore
Blue Mountains	Maitland
Broken Hill	Orange
Byron	Pt Stephens
Cessnock	Queanbeyan
Coffs Harbour	Shellharbour
Dubbo	Shoalhaven
Eurobodalla	Tamworth
Goulburn	Tweed Heads
Grafton	Wagga Wagga
Gt Lakes	Wingecarribee
Greater Taree	Wollondilly

**4. (35 Councils)**

Bellingen	Murray
Cabonne	Muswellbrook
Cobar	Nambucca
Cooma-Monaro	Narrabri
Cootamundra	Narrandera
Cowra	Parkes
Deniliquin	Parry
Forbes	Richmond Valley
Gilgandra	Singleton
Glen Innes	Snowy River
Greater Lithgow	Tumut
Gunnedah	Walgett
Inverell	Wellington
Kiama	Wentworth
Leeton	Yarrowlunla
Maclean	Yass
Moree Plains	Young
Mudgee	

**Category 5. (61 Councils)**

Balranald	Evans	Quirindi
Barraba	Gloucester	Rylstone
Berrigen	Gundagai	Scone
Bingara	Gunning	Severn
Bland	Guyra	Tallaganda
Blayney	Harden	Temora
Bogan	Hay	Tenterfield
Bombala	Holbrook	Tumbarumba
Boorowa	Hume	Uralla
Bourke	Jerilderie	Urana
Brewarrina	Junee	Wakool
Carrathool	Kyogle	Walcha
Central Darling	Lachlan	Warren
Conargo	Lockhart	Weddin
Coolah	Manilla	Yallaroi
Coolamon	Merriwa	
Coonabarabran	Mulwaree	
Coonamble	Murrumbidgee	
Copmanhurst	Murrurundi	
Corowa	Narromine	
Crookwell	Nundle	
Culcairn	Oberon	
Dungog	Pristine Waters	

**TOTAL GENERAL PURPOSE COUNCILS****172**

**Category S3 (12 Councils)**

Castlereagh – Macquarie	New England
Central Murray	North West Weeds
Central Northern	Richmond River
Far North Coast	Southern Slopes
Hawkesbury River	Upper Hunter
Mid Western	Upper Macquarie

**Category S4 (8 Councils)**

Central Tablelands	Lower Clarence
Clarence River	MidCoast
Cudgegong	Riverina Water
Goldenfields Water	Rous

**TOTAL COUNTY COUNCILS 20**

## **DETERMINATION OF ANNUAL REMUNERATION FEES FOR COUNCILLORS AND MAYORS**

Pursuant to s.241 of the Local Government Act 1993, the annual fees to be paid in each of the categories determined under s.234 to Councillors, Mayors, members and chairpersons of County Councils during the period 1 July 2002 to 30 June 2003 are determined as follows:

	<b>Councillor/Member Annual Fee</b>		<b>Mayor/Chairperson Additional Fee*</b>	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Category 5	5,510	6,060	5,665	9,630
Category 4	5,510	7,270	5,665	15,350
Category 3	5,510	12,125	11,330	25,605
Category 2	5,510	12,125	11,330	25,605
Category 1	8,265	15,430	16,995	39,655
Category 1A	11,020	18,185	22,660	51,270
S4	1,100	6,060	2,265	9,630
S3	1,100	3,635	2,265	6,400
S2	11,020	18,185	22,660	51,270
S1	16,530	24,245	97,850	128,750

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

### Local Government Remuneration Tribunal

(The Honourable Charles L Cullen Q.C.)

Dated: 29 April 2002