

**From:** [Barry Le Fevre](#)  
**To:** [lq.consultation@dpac.tas.gov.au](mailto:lq.consultation@dpac.tas.gov.au)  
**Subject:** Reforms to Council numbers and allowances  
**Date:** Thursday, 6 November 2025 10:35:02 AM

---

You don't often get email from [barry.lefevre@bodc.tas.gov.au](mailto:barry.lefevre@bodc.tas.gov.au). [Learn why this is important](#)

To whom it may concern,

I am delighted that the Government is looking at reform around the number of Councillors in Tasmania. I fully support the reduction suggested in the draft. In my own Council decreasing elected members from nine to seven will I believe have a positive impact.

With seven positions being available it will be considerably more difficult to be elected, which is a good thing. It could be assumed that the level of professionalism will increase as a result and the needs of rate payers will be met in a more proficient manner.

Whilst happy with the reform to numbers of elected members I am concerned about other aspects of the draft. Suggesting that a 14.25 % increase in allowances is acceptable because it is cost neutral in my mind demeans the whole process. A 14.25% increase won't be cost neutral for Councils, they will save funds. As we all should know reducing the number of councilors doesn't just impact funding through their allowances. On costs such as travel, P.L. food, IT support, staff related enquiries etc will all reduce. The allowances for elected members should be determined by an independent body to prioritize fairness for all.

I have, for the last 6 years proposed that a minimum allowance for Councillors should be \$20 000. This would be a fairer figure at this time and could encourage working age people to stand for election.

I believe it is crucial that younger people have some incentive to throw their hat in to the ring so to speak and \$20 000 would I believe give them a reasonable level of compensation for time off work to attend meetings and Council events. As the system is at present only those retired, self-funded or on a form of Government benefits are likely to find the position of Councillor as appealing. Many want to give back to their communities and make a positive contribution, they shouldn't be hindered financially to do so.

As mentioned I believe we need representation from the younger demographic. We are all aware of the need to have all age groups represented on council and the absolute necessity to have appropriate succession plans in place. The future of each LGA is important.

Why don't Councillors received the same work related conditions as Public Servants? It makes perfect common sense for them to have Superannuation, holidays, sick and Long Service leave etc as others do. At the moment Councils can and do suffer from having Councillors absent for months at a time or who attend meetings spasmodically. If the system was more prescriptive in relation to employment conditions I believe it would benefit all.

The reforms proposed have merit, need to be extended and hence create a fairer and more professional system.

Barry Le Fevre  
BODC Councillor

