

**Local  
Government  
Remuneration  
Tribunal**

Annual Report  
and  
Determination

*Annual report and determination under sections 239  
and 241 of the Local Government Act 1993*

**17 April  
2018**

## Local Government Remuneration Tribunal

# Contents

---

<b>Contents</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Section 1 Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Section 2 2017 Determination</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Section 3 2018 Review</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Categorisation</b>	<b>6</b>
Categorisation model	6
Allocation of councils into categories	6
<b>Fees</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Findings</b>	<b>12</b>
Quantum of Fees	12
Other matters	12
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Section 4 Determinations</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Determination No. 1- Determination Pursuant to Section 239 of Categories of Councils and County Councils Effective From 1 July 2018</b>	<b>15</b>
Table 1: General Purpose Councils - Metropolitan	15
Table 2: General Purpose Councils – Non-Metropolitan	16
Table 3: County Councils	17
<b>Determination No. 2- Determination Pursuant to Section 241 of Fees for Councillors and Mayors</b>	<b>18</b>
Table 4: Fees for General Purpose and County Councils	18
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix 1 Criteria that apply to categories</b>	<b>19</b>

## Local Government Remuneration Tribunal

# Executive Summary

---

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

### **Categories**

The Tribunal has reviewed the criteria that apply to the categories of councils and the allocation of councils into those categories. The Tribunal found that there was no strong case to change the criteria or the allocation of councils into categories at this time. The criteria applicable to each of the categories are published in Appendix 1 of the determination and are unchanged from 2017.

### **Fees**

The Tribunal has determined that the minimum and maximum fees applicable to each category will be increased by 2.5 per cent which is consistent with the government's policy on wages.

# Section 1 Introduction

---

1. Section 239 of the *Local Government Act 1994* (the LG Act) provides for the Tribunal to determine the categories of councils and mayoral offices and to place each council and mayoral office into one of those categories. The categories are to be determined at least once every 3 years.
2. Section 241 of the LG Act provides for the Tribunal to determine, not later than 1 May in each year, for each of the categories determined under section 239, the maximum and minimum amount of fees to be paid to mayors and councillors of councils, as well as chairpersons and members of county councils.
3. In determining the maximum and minimum fees payable in each of the categories, the Tribunal is required, pursuant to section 242A (1) of the LG Act, to give effect to the same policies on increases in remuneration as those of the Industrial Relations Commission. The current policy on wages is that public sector wages cannot increase by more than 2.5 per cent, and this includes the maximum and minimum fees payable to councillors and mayors and chairpersons and members of county councils.
4. The Tribunal is however able to determine that a council can be placed in another existing or a new category with a higher range of fees without breaching the government's wage policy pursuant to section 242A (3) of the LG Act.
5. The Tribunal's determinations take effect from 1 July in each year.

## Section 2 2017 Determination

---

6. The Tribunal undertook a significant review of the categories and the allocation of councils into each of those categories. The review was prompted by the amalgamation of councils resulting in the creation of 20 new councils and an overall reduction in the number of councils in NSW from 152 to 128.
7. In reviewing the categories the Tribunal examined a range of statistical and demographic data and considered the views of councils and Local Government NSW (the LGNSW). Having regard to that information, the Tribunal determined a categorisation model which differentiates councils primarily on the basis of their geographic location. Other factors which differentiate councils for the purpose of categorisation include population, the sphere of the council's economic influence and the degree of regional servicing.
8. The Tribunal's 2017 Determination was made on 12 April 2017 and determined the categories of general purpose councils as follows:

**Metropolitan**

- Principal CBD
- Major CBD
- Metropolitan Large
- Metropolitan Medium
- Metropolitan Small

**Non-metropolitan**

- Regional City
- Regional Strategic Area
- Regional Rural
- Rural

9. The criteria for the categories were also determined and are now contained in Appendix 1. The Tribunal's determination also provided for each of the 128 Councils to be allocated into one of the above categories.
10. The 2017 Determination provided a general increase of 2.5 per cent which was consistent with the Government's policy on wages.

## Section 3 2018 Review

---

11. The Tribunal wrote to all mayors in November 2017 advising of the commencement of the 2018 Annual Review. In doing so the Tribunal noted that at the time of making the 2017 determination a number of further merger proposals were on hold as a consequence of legal action taken by councils covered by these proposals. On 27 July 2017 the Premier, the Hon Gladys Berejiklian MP, issued a media release which advised that due to the protracted nature of those legal challenges and the impact on ratepayers, that the following mergers would not proceed:
- Burwood, City of Canada Bay and Strathfield Municipal councils
  - Hornsby Shire and Ku-ring-gai councils
  - Hunter's Hill, Lane Cove and City of Ryde councils
  - Mosman Municipal , North Sydney and Willoughby councils
  - Randwick City, Waverley and Woollahra Municipal councils.
12. While the Tribunal is only required to review the categorisation every three years, given the changed circumstances, if requested, the Tribunal stated it would review the allocation of the above metropolitan councils into the existing categories.
13. In this respect, any requests for a review would need to be supported by evidence which would indicate that the council is more appropriately allocated into another category based on the criteria.
14. The Tribunal also stated that it does not intend to alter the groups or the criteria which apply unless there is a very strong case to do so.
15. The Tribunal also wrote to the President of LGNSW in similar terms, and subsequently met with the Chief Executive of LGNSW. The Tribunal wishes to place on record its appreciation to the Chief Executive for meeting with the Tribunal.
16. In response to this review the Tribunal received 13 submissions from individual councils and a submission from LGNSW. Those submissions addressed the categorisation model and criteria, the allocation of councils into those categories, and/or the fees. A summary of the matters raised and the Tribunal's consideration of those matters is outlined below.

## **Local Government Remuneration Tribunal**

### **Categorisation**

#### **Categorisation model**

17. The majority of submissions supported the categorisation model, suggested additional categories or made no comment. Concerns were largely based on the criteria and in particular the emphasis on population to determine appropriate categorisation.
18. One submission also requested that consideration be given to making the criteria for Principal CBD and Major CBD more general in nature.
19. Apart from requests for new categories, no case has been put to the Tribunal to adjust or change the categorisation model. The Tribunal is required to review the categories every three years. As the current model was introduced in 2017 the Tribunal will next consider the model and the allocation of councils into that model in 2020.
20. The Tribunal has reviewed the criteria which apply to the categories of Principal CBD and Major CBD. The criteria for Principal CBD and Major CBD are specific to the characteristics of councils within those categories. This is different to the other categories which have indicative population thresholds and general criteria which describe common features of councils in these groups.

#### **Allocation of councils into categories**

21. The criteria applicable to the categories are outlined in Appendix 1. The categories differentiate councils on the basis of their geographic location with councils grouped as either metropolitan or non-metropolitan. With the exception of Principal CBD and Major CBD, population is the predominant criterion to determine categorisation. Other common features of councils within those categories are also broadly described. These criteria have relevance when population alone does not adequately reflect the status of one council compared to others with similar characteristics. In some instances the additional criteria will be sufficient enough to warrant the categorisation of a council into a group with a higher indicative population range.
22. In respect of the request to reconsider the criteria for Principal CBD and Major CBD, the Tribunal notes that the current criteria are specific to the councils of Sydney City and Parramatta City respectively. Prior to the making of the 2017 determination Sydney City Council was a standalone category. Parramatta City Council was grouped with Newcastle

## Local Government Remuneration Tribunal

City Council and Wollongong City Council. The Tribunal's 2017 review determined that Parramatta City Council would also be a standalone category within the group of metropolitan councils. Newcastle and Wollongong were placed in a separate category, Regional City.

23. The allocation of Sydney City Council and Parramatta City Council into unique categories reflects their status within the metropolitan area. These precincts have been identified by the NSW Government in its metropolitan planning policies<sup>1</sup> as "Metropolitan City Centres" and are the only local government precincts to be given this status. The Tribunal considers that Parramatta City Council is the only council which currently meets the criteria of Major CBD.
24. The Tribunal received ten requests for re-categorisation. Each of those requests was considered having regard to the case put forward and the criteria for each category. A multi variable approach was adopted in assessing each council against all the criteria (not only population) for the requested category and also the relativities within the categories. At the time of making the determination the Tribunal only had available to it population data as of 2016. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) has advised that more up to date population data will not be published until 24 April 2018 which is too late for consideration as part of this review. The Tribunal found that the current categorisation was appropriate, but noted that some of those councils seeking to be moved are likely to meet the criteria for re-categorisation in future determinations in the medium term. A summary of the Tribunal's findings for each of the applications is outlined in the following paragraphs.

### Penrith

25. Penrith sought to be re-categorised to a new category (possibly Metropolitan Large – Growth Centre) to reflect expected population growth and development. The council submitted that the new category could have fees equivalent to Regional City. The submission also drew the Tribunal's attention to the regional servicing role of Penrith to Greater Western Sydney, the Blue Mountains and the Central West of NSW.

---

<sup>1</sup> Greater Sydney Commission's (GSC) Greater Sydney Regional Plan – *A metropolis of three cities – connecting people – March 2018* (GSR Plan); Transport for NSW's *Future Transport Strategy 2056, March 2018*; NSW Government's *The NSW State Infrastructure Strategy 2018-2038, 18 March 2018*.

## **Local Government Remuneration Tribunal**

26. The Tribunal examined Penrith's submission in the context of other councils in the Metropolitan Large category. Penrith currently has the smallest population in this group of councils and the degree of population growth is comparable to other fringe metropolitan councils. While the council area is host to a range of regional facilities these are similar to those available in other council areas within this group. On the basis of the information available the Tribunal does not find there is a case to create a new category to accommodate Penrith.

### **Inner West**

27. Inner West has sought to be re-categorised from Metropolitan Medium to Metropolitan Large. The council has a population of 190,500 (2016) which is substantially below the population of other Metropolitan Large councils. In considering this request the Tribunal has reviewed the additional factors which guide categorisation to both Metropolitan Large and Metropolitan Medium, as outlined in Appendix 1 of this determination. The Tribunal notes that while significant residential development is proposed for this council that development is influenced by a number of urban renewal and infrastructure projects which have either not commenced or are in their early stages. The Tribunal finds the council does not demonstrate a sufficient number of additional criteria to warrant re-categorisation as Metropolitan Large at this time. However, with expected population growth it is likely the council may be more comparable with other Metropolitan Large councils in the short to medium term.

### **Randwick**

28. Randwick has sought to be re-categorised from Metropolitan Medium to Metropolitan Large principally on the basis of its regional servicing and facilities. The Tribunal notes that the council's population of 146,250 (2016) is squarely within the indicative range for this category of (100,000 to 200,000). In reviewing this request the Tribunal has also considered the degree of regional servicing and sphere of economic influence. Having regard to those factors the Tribunal does not find that the council can display additional criteria to a degree comparable to other councils in Metropolitan Large or that re-categorisation into this group is appropriate.

### **Canada Bay**

## **Local Government Remuneration Tribunal**

29. Canada Bay has sought to be re-categorised from Metropolitan Small to Metropolitan Medium. Canada Bay has a population 90,850 (2016) which is the largest of the councils in Metropolitan Small but still well below the indicative range of Metropolitan Medium councils. The council has put a case forward based on its growing regional influence with a large influx of workers, shoppers and visitors each day.
30. The Tribunal has compared the profile of Canada Bay to other councils in Metropolitan Medium and finds that the scale of its operations and degree of regional servicing are not sufficient to warrant re-categorisation. The Tribunal notes however, that similar to Inner West, expected population growth it is likely to make the council more comparable to those in Metropolitan Medium in the medium term.

### **Willoughby and North Sydney**

31. Both Willoughby and North Sydney have sought to be re-categorised from Metropolitan Small to Metropolitan Medium. Under the new categorisation model these councils were allocated into a category with lower fees than those previously available under the former categorisation. The Tribunal finds that while some existing councillors may be receiving lower fees as a result of the revised categorisation, this is not a factor in the categorisation of councils into categories.
32. The categories have been developed to group councils with as many like characteristics as possible. The Tribunal has considered the characteristics of Willoughby and North Sydney in the context of those that apply to both Metropolitan Small and Metropolitan Medium.
33. Willoughby has a population of 77,950 (2016) and North Sydney 72,150 (2016). Willoughby has sought to be re-categorised having regard to additional criteria including its scale of operations and businesses and the regional significance of its centres. North Sydney has sought consideration of its regional services and facilities and high percentage of non-resident visitors and workers.
34. Both councils have sought recognition of the significant number and percentage of non-resident workers, however the available data from the ABS would suggest that many other metropolitan councils across all categories host a significant number of non-resident workers.
35. The Tribunal notes that the current population of both councils is within the indicative population range for Metropolitan Small councils and well below that of Metropolitan Medium. Having regard to the addition criteria that apply to Metropolitan Small and

## **Local Government Remuneration Tribunal**

Metropolitan Medium, the Tribunal finds that the characteristics of Willoughby and North Sydney are more appropriately aligned with those of other Metropolitan Small councils and finds no case for them to be re-categorised at this time.

### **Port Macquarie**

36. Port Macquarie has sought to be re-categorised from Regional Rural to Regional Strategic Area. Alternatively, it is requested that consideration be given to the creation of a new category for similar councils in the Regional Rural group.
37. Port Macquarie has a population of 79,650 (2016) which is significantly below the indicative population range of Regional Strategic Area councils. The Tribunal finds that Port Macquarie has not demonstrated the additional criteria to warrant inclusion into this group.
38. The Tribunal notes that there is a large population range of those councils included in the Regional Rural category. These councils are grouped together to reflect their like features such as having a major township which provides regional servicing to smaller rural communities and rural councils. The Tribunal does not propose to further differentiate this group at this time.

### **Maitland**

39. Maitland has sought to be re-categorised from Regional Rural to Regional Strategic Area or that a new category be created between Regional Rural and Regional Strategic Area.
40. Maitland has a population of 78,200 (2016) which is significantly below the indicative population range of Regional Strategic Area councils. The Tribunal finds that Maitland has not demonstrated the additional criteria to warrant inclusion into this group. As outlined above the Tribunal does not propose to further differentiate this group at this time.

### **Hilltops**

41. Hilltops Council has sought to be re-categorised from Rural to Regional Rural. The new Hilltops Council is an amalgamation of three former councils in the Rural category (Young, Boorowa and Harden). The submission states that the new council has increased complexity of business and should be recognised as Regional Rural.
42. The Tribunal notes that Hilltops has a population of 19,150 (2016) which is just below the indicative population range of Regional Rural councils. The category of Regional Rural currently includes one council – Broken Hill – which has a population similar to that of Hilltops. Broken Hill warrants categorisation as Regional Rural in recognition of the degree

## **Local Government Remuneration Tribunal**

of regional servicing it provides to far western NSW. It is not considered that Hilltops provides the same degree of regional services and on that basis re-categorisation is not warranted at this time.

### **Leeton**

43. Leeton has sought reconsideration of the criteria for eligibility to the categorisation of Regional Rural to take into account councils with populations of less than 20,000. Leeton has a population of 11,750 (2016).
44. Leeton has not sufficiently demonstrated that it meets the additional criteria for re-categorisation to Regional Rural level. The Tribunal does not propose to further differentiate this group at this time.

### **Fees**

45. The LGNSW submission requested that the Tribunal increase fees by the allowable maximum of 2.5 per cent. The submission also reiterated its view that the current arrangement for setting fees is inappropriate and does not provide proper compensation for the significant workload and the range of responsibilities of mayors and councillors. Comparative information was presented in respect to board fees, fees paid to mayors and councillors of councils in Queensland and salaries for Members of Parliament. It was also suggested that when determining fees the Tribunal consider other matters, including the new induction and other professional development training requirements and the implementation of the NSW Local Government Capability Framework. The LGNSW submission also sought consideration of the non-payment of superannuation.
46. A number of submissions also sought an increase to the allowable maximum of 2.5 per cent and raised similar issues to LGNSW in respect to the current fees not being adequate compensation for the heavy or “full-time” workload and time commitment required to carry out mayoral and councillor duties.
47. One submission also raised the matter of fees for deputy mayors, submitting that an additional fee of \$200.00 per month be payable when the role of deputy mayor exists in a council.

## Local Government Remuneration Tribunal

### Findings

#### Quantum of Fees

48. The Tribunal has considered the submissions received and notes the comparisons drawn between the fees paid to councillors and mayors in NSW with those in other states, members of Parliament in NSW, and members of boards and committees. The Tribunal is mindful that the roles and responsibilities of councillors and mayors in NSW are outlined in the LG Act and notes that they are not necessarily comparable to the roles and responsibilities of councillors and mayors in other states, members of Parliament or members of boards and committees.
49. The Tribunal also notes that some of the other matters raised by submissions are more appropriately dealt with in the context of the current Local Government reform agenda and are outside the Tribunal's powers.
50. The Tribunal is required to have regard to the Government's wages policy when determining the increase to apply to the maximum and minimum fees that apply to councillors and mayors. The public sector wages policy currently provides for a cap on increases of 2.5 per cent.
51. The Tribunal has reviewed the key economic indicators, including the Consumer Price Index and Wage Price Index, and had regard to budgetary limitations imposed by the Government's policy of rate pegging, and finds that the full increase of 2.5 per cent is warranted. The 2.5 per cent increase will apply to the minimum and the maximum of the ranges for all existing categories.

#### Other matters

52. The Tribunal notes that the NSW Independent Local Government Review Panel made a number of recommendations in 2013 which addressed the role and remuneration of mayors and deputy mayors. The Tribunal understands that those recommendations have not yet been implemented or were supported by the Government in part only.
53. Should the Government's policies change with respect to remuneration the Tribunal would be willing to participate in any further review or consideration of this matter.
54. The matter of the non-payment of superannuation has been previously raised in submissions to the Tribunal and is not a matter for the Tribunal to determine. Section

## Local Government Remuneration Tribunal

251 of the LG Act confirms that councillors are not employees of the council and the fee paid does not constitute a salary under the Act. The Tribunal notes that the Australian Tax Office has made a definitive ruling (ATO ID 2007/205) that allows councillors to redirect their annual fees into superannuation on a pre-tax basis and is a matter for councils (*Ref: Councillor Handbook, Oct 2017, Office of Local Government p.69*).

55. Councils have raised the matter of separate fees for deputy mayors on previous occasions and the Tribunal notes that it has previously determined that there is no provision in the LG Act to empower the Tribunal to determine a separate fee or fee increase for deputy mayors. The method for determining separate fees, if any, for a deputy mayor is provided in section 249 of the LG Act as follows:

### **249 Fixing and payment of annual fees for the mayor**

- (1) *A council must pay the mayor an annual fee.*
- (2) *The annual fee must be paid in addition to the fee paid to the mayor as a councillor.*
- (3) *A council may fix the annual fee and, if it does so, it must fix the annual fee in accordance with the appropriate determination of the Remuneration Tribunal.*
- (4) *A council that does not fix the annual fee must pay the appropriate minimum fee determined by the Remuneration Tribunal.*
- (5) *A council may pay the deputy mayor (if there is one) a fee determined by the council for such time as the deputy mayor acts in the office of the mayor. The amount of the fee so paid must be deducted from the mayor's annual fee."*

## Conclusion

56. The Tribunal's determinations have been made with the assistance of the two Assessors - Mr Ian Reynolds and Mr Tim Hurst. The allocation of councils into each of the categories, pursuant to section 239 of the LG Act, is outlined in Determination No. 1. The maximum and minimum fees paid to councillors and mayors and members and chairpersons of county councils, pursuant to section 241 of the LG Act, are outlined in Determination No. 2.

## **Local Government Remuneration Tribunal**

**The Local Government Remuneration Tribunal**

***Signed***

**Dr Robert Lang**

**Dated:** 17 April 2018

## Section 4 Determinations

---

### Determination No. 1- Determination Pursuant to Section 239 of Categories of Councils and County Councils Effective From 1 July 2018

**Table 1: General Purpose Councils - Metropolitan**

Principal CBD (1)	Major CBD (1)
Sydney	Parramatta
Metropolitan Large (8)	Metropolitan Medium (9)
Blacktown	Bayside
Canterbury-Bankstown	Campbelltown
Cumberland	Georges River
Fairfield	Hornsby
Liverpool	Ku-ring-gai
Northern Beaches	Inner West
Penrith	Randwick
Sutherland	Ryde
	The Hills
Metropolitan Small (11)	
Burwood	
Camden	
Canada Bay	
Hunters Hill	
Lane Cove	
Mosman	
North Sydney	
Strathfield	
Waverley	
Willoughby	
Woollahra	

## Local Government Remuneration Tribunal

**Table 2: General Purpose Councils – Non-Metropolitan**

Regional City (2)	Regional Strategic Area (2)
Newcastle	Central Coast
Wollongong	Lake Macquarie

  

Regional Rural (37)	Rural (57)
Albury	Balranald
Armidale	Bellingen
Ballina	Berrigan
Bathurst	Bland
Bega	Blayney
Blue Mountains	Bogan
Broken Hill	Bourke
Byron	Brewarrina
Cessnock	Cabonne
Clarence Valley	Carrathool
Coffs Harbour	Central Darling
Dubbo	Cobar
Eurobodalla	Coolamon
Goulburn Mulwaree	Coonamble
Griffith	Cootamundra-Gundagai
Hawkesbury	Cowra
Kempsey	Dungog
Kiama	Edward River
Lismore	Federation
Lithgow	Forbes
Maitland	Gilgandra
Mid-Coast	Glen Innes Severn
Mid-Western	Greater Hume
Orange	Gunnedah
Port Macquarie-Hastings	Gwydir
Port Stephens	Hay
Queanbeyan-Palerang	Hilltops
Richmond Valley	Inverell
Shellharbour	June
Shoalhaven	
Singleton	
Snowy Monaro	
Tamworth	
Tweed	
Wagga Wagga	
Wingecarribee	
Wollondilly	

## Local Government Remuneration Tribunal

**Table 3: County Councils**

<b>Water (4)</b>
Central Tablelands
Goldenfields Water
Riverina Water
Rous

<b>Other (6)</b>
Castlereagh-Macquarie
Central Murray
Hawkesbury River
New England Tablelands
Upper Hunter
Upper Macquarie

## Local Government Remuneration Tribunal

### Determination No. 2- Determination Pursuant to Section 241 of 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 to Councillors, Mayors, Members and Chairpersons of County Councils effective on and from 1 July 2018 are determined as follows:

**Table 4: Fees for General Purpose and County Councils**

Category		Councillor/Member Annual Fee		Mayor/Chairperson Additional Fee*	
		Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
General Purpose Councils – Metropolitan	Principal CBD	26,970	39,540	164,980	217,080
	Major CBD	17,980	33,310	38,200	107,620
	Metropolitan Large	17,980	29,670	38,200	86,440
	Metropolitan Medium	13,480	25,160	28,640	66,860
	Metropolitan Small	8,970	19,790	19,100	43,150
General Purpose Councils – Non-metropolitan	Regional City	17,980	31,260	38,200	97,370
	Regional Strategic Area	17,980	29,670	38,200	86,440
	Regional Rural	8,970	19,790	19,100	43,170
	Rural	8,970	11,860	9,540	25,880
County Councils	Water	1,780	9,890	3,820	16,250
	Other	1,780	5,910	3,820	10,790

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

**The Local Government Remuneration Tribunal**

*Signed*

**Dr Robert Lang**

**Dated:** 17 April 2018

# 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 has 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.

## Local Government Remuneration Tribunal

### Metropolitan Large

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

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 population of 100,000.

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 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.

## **Local Government Remuneration Tribunal**

### **Regional City**

Councils categorised as Regional City will typically have a population above 150,000. These councils are metropolitan in nature with major residential, commercial and industrial areas. These Councils typically host government departments, major tertiary education and health facilities and incorporate high density commercial and residential development.

These councils provide a full range of higher order services and activities along with arts, culture, recreation and entertainment facilities to service the wider community and broader region. These councils typically also contain ventures which have a broader State and national focus which impact upon the operations of the council.

Newcastle City Council and Wollongong City Councils are categorised as Regional City.

### **Regional Strategic Area**

Councils categorised as Regional Strategic Area are differentiated from councils in the Regional Rural category on the basis of their significant population. Councils categorised as Regional Strategic Area will typically have a population above 200,000. These councils contain a mix of urban and rural settlements. They provide a range of services and activities including business, office and retail uses, along with arts, culture, recreation and entertainment facilities to service the wider community. These councils host tertiary education campuses and health facilities.

While councils categorised as Regional Strategic Area may have populations which exceed those of Regional City, they would not typically provide the same range of regional services or have an equivalent sphere of economic influence.

Central Coast Council and Lake Macquarie Council are categorised as Regional Strategic Area.

### **Regional Rural**

Councils categorised as Regional Rural will typically have a minimum population of 20,000.

Other features which distinguish them from other non-metropolitan councils include:

- a major town or towns with the largest commercial component of any location in the surrounding area
- a significant urban population existing alongside a traditional farming sector, and are surrounded by smaller towns and villages or may be located on or close to the coast with high levels of population and tourist facilities
- provide a full range of higher-order services including business, office and retail uses with arts, culture, recreation and entertainment centres
- regional services to the wider community through principal referral hospitals, tertiary education services and major regional airports
- these councils may also attract large visitor numbers to established tourism ventures.

## **Local Government Remuneration Tribunal**

### **Rural**

Councils categorised as Rural will typically have a population below 20,000.

Other features which distinguish them from other non-metropolitan councils 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.

### **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 *Noxious Weeds Act 1993*.