Follow-up Actions from Generic Geographic Features niesting [21 February 2006]

Earth Pairicuth

The Board noted that this item was still in auspension, with Garth Cant of Canterbury University
In Board noted the navigational unportance—a prominent headland on way to the entrance to
laving promised a post graduate research student to dig out every archival document available.

Lystelon disclory/Whakaraugo, Therefore any change would need to be made with care and
lyought to maritime safety. Driv Tipene O'Regna advised that no one locally (of the Rünanga)
actually knows which is the correct spelling—only that the 'I' should become an 'r'—and there is
no question of this. But what of the wowlet? No one has got any solid evidence, it is best left as
an archival job and Dr Garth Cant has promined a post grandate research student this coning
as an archival job and Dr Garth Cant used the Board to get a FORST or MORST grant into his
semester. A student has been chosen but needs to complete her thesis (within the next few weeks)

The Board noted that Garth Cant used the Board to be able to do this. The
Board agreed to DEFER its decision.

The Board of White Canth Canth Canth Cant about this research.

The Board of White all of the following new place name submission proposals, with the
exception of White this within the role of Te Ednanga o Nghi Tahu, were forwarded to the
exception of White this within the role of Te Ednanga o Nghi Tahu, were forwarded to the
exception of White this within the role of Te Ednanga o Nghi Tahu, were forwarded to the
exception of White this within the role of Te Ednanga o Nghi Tahu, were forwarded to the
exception of White this proposition, though it is not a

The Board moted that Nghi Or perfectly happy with this proposition, though it is not a

Firth of Thames

88. Waimangō Point

89. Waimangō Stream

The Board accepted the evidence supporting that these features should be correctly spelt Waimangō, not Waimangū. The Board noted that the submission was actually just for the point, but the Secretary has included the associated stream also. The Board noted that this one seems reasonably clear, but there has been no discussion with tangata whenua. The Board discussed going ahead with notification as an intention and if there are any objections from tangata whenua, then they can provide their views. A macron was confirmed on the 'o'.

Resolution

That Waimangō Point and Waimangō Stream be ACCEPTED by the Board as intentions to assign, and be gazetted as such.

Moved: Ms Sylvia Allan

Seconded: Professor Michael Roche

All in favour Carried

Action Required

• The Secretary to process standard actions for 'intention' names. See footnote 3 on page 12.

Lunch 12.30pm - 1pm

Banks Peninsula

90. Pulpit Rock

The Board noted that this submission had been made by one of Mr John Spittal's staff members. The submission was noted as being very well researched and documented. The Board discussed whether there might be an issue with the two other Pulpit Rocks that exist, but did not believe there to be an issue with duplication – the other two Pulpit Rocks being at Muriwai Beach and Dunedin and therefore far enough away so as not to cause a problem. The Board noted that this Pulpit Rock is a very distinctive feature. Dr Sir Tipene O'Regan advised that the local Rūnanga have no objection.

Resolution

That Pulpit Rock be ACCEPTED by the Board as an intention to assign, and be gazetted as such.

Moved: Dr Sir Tipene O'Regan Seconded: Dr Apirana Mahuika

All in favour Carried

Action Required

• The Secretary to process standard actions for 'intention' names. See footnote 3 on page 12.

Nelson Lakes

91. Rotoiti or Rotoiti South or The Village of Rotoiti or 'Rotoiti/St Arnaud' The Board's consideration lasted 58 minutes, the main points of discussion are summarised as follows:

- Many examples of communities on the edge of a lake, which are named after the lake, e.g.
 Taupo, Wanaka. Though there are other examples that do not follow this convention, e.g.
 Lake Wakatipu and Queenstown.
- The area was re-surveyed with smaller lots in 1921, from which time it was named St Arnaud by Broderick to avoid confusion with the Rotoiti in the North Island. It was from 1921 that people started to take up residence. Prior to 1921, the subdivision had been known as Rotoiti, but had not been occupied as a community.

89. Waimango Stream
The Board accepted the evidence supporting that these features should be correctly spelt
Waimango, not Waimangu. The Board noted that the submission was actually just for the poin
but the Secretary has included the associated stream also. The Board noted that this one seems
reasonably clear, but there has been no discussion with tangata whenus. The Board discussed
going ahead with notification as an intention and if there are any objections from tangata when
then they can provide their views. A macron was confirmed on the 'o.

Resolution
That Waimangö Point and Waimangö Stream be ACCEPTED by the Soard as intentions to assign, and be gazetted as such.

Messed. Me Suite Allen

Seconded: Professor Michael Roche
All in favour

Action Required

100 evertary to process standard actions for 'intention' names. See footnote 3 on page

8 12.30pm - Charles Company

100 evertary to process standard actions for 'intention' names. See footnote 3 on page

8 12.30pm - Charles Company

8 12.3

The submission was noted or one of the submission had been made by one of the John spiritual start members.

Whether there might be an isself of the two other Pulpit Rocks that exist, but did not believe the to be an issue with duplication.

To be an issue with duplication of the two Pulpit Rocks being at Muriwai Beach and Dunedi and therefore far enough away so at the cause a problem. The Board noted that this Pulpit Rocks a very distinctive feature. Dr Sir Tile O Regan advised that the local Rünanga have no objection.

That Pidpit Rock be ACCEPTED by the Board of Secution to assign, and be got Moved:

Dr Sir Tipene O'Regan
Seconded: Dr Apirana Mahuika
All in favour
Carried

• The Board sought to determine the level of confusion between the two Rotoiti's.

- The Board noted that the Frameworks document states that the Board does not change a name of a community without good reason or without extensive community support.
- The Board considered whether there is there a threshold for the level of public views? The Board noted that there is a distinction between a geographical feature and a locality, which is where a community lives, and therefore there needs to be significant community support for any alteration to a long standing community name.
- Rotoiti appears to have continued to be used after settlement by people.
- The resurgence of St Arnaud appears to have come about through the DOC National Park visitor centre, which was erected in the mid-1980s and which reinforced the gazetted decision to formally assign St Arnaud for both the locality and the Post Office.
- Correspondence (59 in total): 44 in opposition, 8 in support, 1 not objecting, and 6 supporting a dual name.
- Dual naming is about two names representing two cultural positions. Rotoiti per se, is the lake, and it is not the locality. There appears to be no argument for dual naming, as there are two different geographical places.
- The name change in 1951 was mostly about mail not being sent to the right place, but that is less of a problem now. But the emergency services issue does not go away, and in fact it has got worse since national call centres removed local exchanges and therefore local knowledge.
- Changing the name of a community, which has already got a name and has had a name for quite a while, needs a fairly clear broad acceptance from the community that that is what they want.
- There is a distinction between the importance in getting the names of the features right, especially if they've had names in the past. The names that are assigned to communities, have to take more account of what the people in those communities want.
- Noted that the RDCC had asked the TDC to be neutral, which the TDC agreed to. The Board thought that this was unusual because if the proposal were to have any chance of acceptance, support from the TDC should be sought.
- Do not actually quite know what the balance of views are in this community, but clearly there are quite a lot of people that don't like the proposal and quite a lot that do.
- In general the submissions were very well researched and considered.
- Three factors should be considered by the Board:
- 1. A strong reason, even against a level of community opposition, would be if restoring an original Māori name for that place. In this case the lake already has a name.
- 2. A reasonably high level of community support, obviously not everyone, but more than a narrow majority.
- 3. Actual support from the TDC, rather than being encouraged to be neutral.
- Noted, in particular, the submission from Helen Campbell, and that her research had revealed Mangatawai (Ngāti Apa) as the original Māori name for this area.
- Noted the newspaper article by the Marlborough Express, and the comments made. A Māori name is relevant to Māori and while acknowledging that pre-European Māori were nomadic visitors, equally so are the residents who have holiday homes at St Arnaud today.
- Could test the community's views further by notifying an intention to alter, but that would
 rightly be perceived that the Board supports a change. So the Board needs to be sure of its
 decision before proceeding through the notification process. There would need to be a
 compelling reason for the Board to put forth a change.
- Clearly there are historical reasons for both names. Could argue it quite strongly both ways. The community is split and it is not known exactly what that split is, but there are people on both sides. This tends to favour the status quo.
- No need to undertake further research or seek further information as there is sufficient information before the Board now.

The Board sought to determine the level of confusion between the two Rotoiti's.

The Board noted that the Frameworks document states that the Board does not change a nam of a community without good reason or without extensive community support.

The Board considered whether there is there a threshold for the level of public views? The Board noted that there is a distinction between a geographical feature and a locality, which is where a community lives, and therefore there needs to be significant community support for any alteration to a long standing community name.

Rotoiti appears to have continued to be used after settlement by people.

The resurgence of St. Arnaud appears to have come about through the DOC National Park visitor centre, which was erected in the mid-1980s and which reinforced the gazetted decision to formally assign St Arnaud for both the locality and the Post Office.

Correspondence (59 in total): 44 in opposition, 8 in support, 1 not objecting, and 6 supporting a dual name.

Dual naming is about two names representing two cultural positions. Rotoiti per se, is the late, and it is not the locality. There appears to be no argument for dual naming, as there are two different geographical places.

The name change in 1951 was mostly about mail not being sent to the right place, but that is sent to the right place, but that is sent to the right place, but that is sent to the right place of the right place of

Change (S) the name of a community, which has already got a name and has had a name for quite a wife proceeds a fairly clear broad acceptance from the community that that is what they want.

There is a distinct between the importance in getting the names of the features right, especially if they were names in the past. The names that are assigned to communities, have to take more account of what the people in those communities want.

Noted that the RDCC hall the TDC to be neutral, which the TDC agreed to. The Board thought that this was unusually see if the proposal were to have any chance of acceptance, support from the TDC should be to be.

are quite a lot of people that don't like proposal and quite a lot that do.

In general the submissions were very well bearched and considered.

Three factors should be considered by the Box of the factors should be considered by the Box of the factors should be if restoring reason, even against a level of common original Māori name for that place. In this case of the already has a name.

2. A reasonably high level of community support, obtoos has not everyone, but more than the contract of the contract o

Mangatawai (Ngāti Apa) as the original Māori narge for this area.

Noted the newspaper article by the Marlborough Express, and the conformade. A Māor name is relevant to Māori and while acknowledging that pre-European Marchovere nomadic visitors, equally so are the residents who have holiday homes at St Arnaud today.

rightly be perceived that the Board supports a change. So the Board needs to be sure of its decision before proceeding through the notification process. There would need to be a compelling reason for the Board to put forth a change.

The community is split and it is not known exactly what that split is, but there are people of both sides. This tends to favour the status quo.

• Is Rotoiti likely to be the name that early Māori gave to the place that they went to, notwithstanding the Ngāti Apa name of Mangatawai? If it is, then a dual name may be appropriate because there are a lot of people who like the name St Arnaud.

• What does it take for a community to get their name changed? If the decision was left to the community then no change would happen, because 100% buy-in would never be reached. So one shouldn't expect 100%. Name changes should be an unusual occurrence as names ought to endure. The times that the Board considers name changes is usually where the name is spelt incorrectly; or there is good evidence that it is wrong; or that there was a name that was already there which has been superseded and replaced with another one and shouldn't have been.

First motion to assign a dual name Rotoiti/St Arnaud:

2 in favour, 5 against, **Not carried**. Based on the desire to recognise the equal significance that both these names have within the community. Such a decision puts both names on the table and the community could respond to the public notification accordingly.

Moved: Ms Sylvia Allan
Seconded: Dr Sir Tipene O'Regan
2 in favour
5 against
Not carried

Second motion to decline the submission proposal by the RDCC:

5 in favour, 2 against, Carried. Based on the following main points:

- St Arnaud having been assigned as the official name for the locality and Post Office more than 50 years ago;
- Rotoiti is already preserved as an original Māori name for the lake;
- Emergency services confusion would be exacerbated, if Rotoiti was restored for the locality name;
- Lack of a strong reason to restore the original Māori name for that place, and the question remains as to what is the original Māori name, if any;
- Lack of a high level of community support for the change, as required in the Board's Frameworks guidelines;
- Lack of support from the Tasman District Council.

Moved: Dr Kay Booth
Seconded: Mr David Barnes
5 in favour
2 against
Carried

- One of the driving considerations of the Board was the clear level of internal division amongst
 the submissions, so there was just not sufficient mandate for change.
- The decline decision does not preclude those in favour of a change pursuing significant community buy-in and also Council support, then re-submitting their name change proposal.

Action Required

• The Secretary to process standard actions for 'declined' names. See footnote 4 on page 13.

Dr Apirana Mahuika left the meeting at 2.30 pm