

#### *Firth of Thames*

88. Waimangō Point

89. Waimangō Stream

The Board accepted the evidence supporting that these features should be correctly spelt Waimangō, not Waimangu. 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.



- 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.



- 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*