



David More
New Plymouth District Council
Private Bag 2025
NEW PLYMOUTH 4342

Draft policy on naming and re-naming of roads, private roads and rights-of-way
By email: David.More@npdc.govt.nz

13 July 2018

SUBMISSION TO THE NEW PLYMOUTH DISTRICT COUNCIL'S DRAFT POLICY ON NAMING AND RE-NAMING OF ROADS, PRIVATE ROADS AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY

Tēnā koe David,

1. On behalf of Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa Trust (Te Kotahitanga) and Ngā Hapū o Te Atiawa Iwi (Ngā Hapū o Te Atiawa) we appreciate the opportunity to provide comment on New Plymouth District Council's (the Council) draft policy on naming and re-naming of roads, private roads and rights-of-way (the Policy).

Introduction - Te Atiawa

2. Te Atiawa Iwi (Te Atiawa) exercise manawhenua (authority) over the ancestral lands, waters, taonga species, wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga within the Te Atiawa rohe (area of interest) which extends from Te Rau o Te Huia along the coast to the Herekawe Stream, inland to Maunga Taranaki and offshore out to 12 nautical miles. Te Atiawa has occupied this rohe for centuries.
3. Te Kotahitanga is the governance entity for the iwi of Te Atiawa (Taranaki) and has a responsibility to ensure that the interests of Te Atiawa are safe-guarded. This includes considering the extent to which proposed policy may impact on the historical, cultural and spiritual interests of Te Atiawa within it's rohe and those areas under statutory acknowledgements and/or Te Atiawa Iwi Claims Settlement Act 2016.

4. Te Atiawa has rights and interests including, but not limited to:
 - a) rights and interests arising under the Te Atiawa Iwi Claims Settlement Act 2016;
 - b) Draft Te Atiawa Iwi Environmental Management Plan (which will be lodged within the lifetime of this Policy);
 - c) rights and interests according to tikanga and customary law; rights and interests arising from the common law (including the common law relating to aboriginal title and customary law); and rights and interests under the Treaty of Waitangi and its principles.
5. Te Atiawa seek to ensure that these rights and interests are recognised in the Council's Policy and there is alignment with the outcomes of Te Atiawa's key tribal documents:
 - a) Te Atiawa Iwi Claims Settlement Act 2016; and
 - b) Draft Te Atiawa Iwi Environmental Management Plan (which will be lodged within the lifetime of this Policy).

Submission on the Policy

6. Te Kotahitanga has reviewed the Policy and provides the following comments.
7. Clause 5c of the Policy states that where public roads require naming or renaming, iwi and hapū are an affected party. We support this and propose that any name provided by an affected party is granted a higher status than one that is proposed by an interested party.
8. Clause 8 of the Policy acknowledges the proposal of Māori road names. We support this and propose that where Māori names are proposed in areas of importance to Māori, these names are given priority.
9. Clause 9 of the Policy outlines the District-specific criteria. We would like to see the inclusion of specific clauses that acknowledge the importance of Māori road names in areas of significance to Māori, and we request that priority is given to this.
10. Clause 9(c)(ix) of the Policy outlines the AS/NZS 4819:2011 (LINZ-related) criteria and states that names be a maximum length of 15 letters. Iwi and hapū may propose the full ancestral name of their tūpuna. We would like assurance that iwi/hapū would not be immediately discounted when proposing a name exceeding 15 letters.
11. Clause 13(a) and (d) of the Policy state that where Māori names are proposed by an individual, iwi or hapū, at least one will be included in the final list of four names. Where applicable, we would like to see at least 2 Māori names be included in the final list.

Conclusion

12. In conclusion, Te Kotahitanga and Ngā Hapū o Te Atiawa appreciate the opportunity to provide comment on this Policy and hope that our comments are useful. Please contact Sera Gibson on sera@teatiawa if you have any questions.

Nāku, nā



Hemi Sundgren
Pouwhakahaere / Chief Executive
Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa Trust

Proposed Road Naming Policy Submission Form

1. Your Details

Full Name:

Joseph Bolton

Physical Address:

9 Marua Palm Grove, Upper Hutt

Phone Number:

0275267599

Email:

info@poppyplaces.nz

2. Your Feedback

1. The proposed policy is easier to understand than the current policy.

Agree

2. Proposed under Statement 4(c), the Council should facilitate a consensus, where affected parties cannot reach agreement on a proposed road name.

Agree

3. The descriptions in Statement 5(a-c) regarding affected and interested parties are useful.

Agree

4. For Statement 6(a-e), the proposed consultation process for affected and interested parties, including outgoing information is clear and easy to understand.

Strongly agree

5. The process described in Statement 7(a-h) for proposing a road name is clear and easy to understand.

Strongly agree

6. The criteria in Statement 8(a-d) for proposing a Māori road name is useful and practical.

Agree

7. By presenting them as two groups, the assessment criteria in Statement 9(a-c) improve understanding of where they come from.

Agree

8. Statement 9(b)(ii) mitigates the risk of a road being named after a living person, who is then convicted of a criminal offense(s).

Agree

9. The provisions under Statement 10(a-h) regarding private roads and rights-of-way are clear and easy to understand.

Agree

10. The new provision at Statement 11(a-e) about new subdivisions will improve the timely completion of road naming processes.

Agree

11. The new provision proposed for retirement villages at Statement 12(a-e) is clear and useful.

Agree

12. The details at Statement 13(a-d) regarding the process for arriving at a final list of proposed names is useful.

Agree

13. The minimum final report requirements at Statement 14(a-c) will provide enough information for the Council to make an informed decision. The minimum final report requirements at Statement 14(a-c) will provide enough information for the Council to make an informed decision.

Agree

14. Statement 15(a-c) and how a road sign may be eligible for the RSA Poppy provides useful information about the process.

Strongly agree

If you have any comments you would like to make about the proposed policy, please use this space.

The Poppy Places Trust considers the new policy to be very good. We would like to see the clause reflect Poppy Places involvement, therefore we suggest amendment as follows: "Eligible road names managed by the New Zealand poppy Places Trust, will have the image of the RSA Poppy placed on the sign".
thank you

3. Thank You!

Thank-you for giving us your feedback on our proposed Road Naming Policy!

Proposed Road Naming Policy Submission Form

1. Your Details

Full Name:

Ngahi Marks

Physical Address:

Level 7, 155 The Terrace, Wellington Central, Wellington, 6011

Phone Number:

044600418

Email:

nmarks@linz.govt.nz

2. Your Feedback

1. The proposed policy is easier to understand than the current policy.

Neutral

2. Proposed under Statement 4(c), the Council should facilitate a consensus, where affected parties cannot reach agreement on a proposed road name.

Strongly agree

3. The descriptions in Statement 5(a-c) regarding affected and interested parties are useful.

Agree

4. For Statement 6(a-e), the proposed consultation process for affected and interested parties, including outgoing information is clear and easy to understand.

Agree

5. The process described in Statement 7(a-h) for proposing a road name is clear and easy to understand.

Agree

6. The criteria in Statement 8(a-d) for proposing a Māori road name is useful and practical.

Agree

7. By presenting them as two groups, the assessment criteria in Statement 9(a-c) improve understanding of where they come from.

Agree

8. Statement 9(b)(ii) mitigates the risk of a road being named after a living person, who is then convicted of a criminal offense(s).

Neutral

9. The provisions under Statement 10(a-h) regarding private roads and rights-of-way are clear and easy to understand.

Agree

10. The new provision at Statement 11(a-e) about new subdivisions will improve the timely completion of road naming processes.

Agree

11. The new provision proposed for retirement villages at Statement 12(a-e) is clear and useful.

Agree

12. The details at Statement 13(a-d) regarding the process for arriving at a final list of proposed names is useful.

13. The minimum final report requirements at Statement 14(a-c) will provide enough information for the Council to make an informed decision. The minimum final report requirements at Statement 14(a-c) will provide enough information for the Council to make an informed decision.

Agree

14. Statement 15(a-c) and how a road sign may be eligible for the RSA Poppy provides useful information about the process.

Agree

If you have any comments you would like to make about the proposed policy, please use this space.

AS/NZS 4819:2011 (LINZ-related) criteria:

1. Please include that "the road type shall be selected from Appendix B - Road Types New Zealand".
2. All proposed road names are sent to LINZ, by the Council only, not the developer, to check before final approval is granted (this is part of the current process).

3. Thank You!

Thank-you for giving us your feedback on our proposed Road Naming Policy!



David More
Katiohutohu
New Plymouth District Council

Via email: david.more@npdc.govt.nz

Rāmere, 08 Pipiri, 2018

Naming and Re-naming of Roads, Private Roads and Rights-of-Way Policy

Tēnā koe David,

1. On behalf of Te Korowai o Ngāruahine Trust (TKONT) thank you for providing us with the opportunity to provide a submission on the New Plymouth District Council's Naming and Renaming of Roads, Private Roads and Rights of Way Policy.
2. Ngāruahine's interests are first and foremost as tangata whenua with a recognised area of interest from the Waingongoro to Taungatara rivers. Ngāruahine iwi has a special cultural, spiritual, historical and traditional association with the whenua within our rohe. The northern end of our rohe extends to the Waipuku Stream, within the New Plymouth district boundary and covers the rohe of Kanihi-Umutahi and Okahu-Inuawai hapū.
3. TKONT, as the post-settlement governance entity for Ngāruahine has a responsibility to ensure that the interests of Ngāruahine (iwi and hapū) are safe-guarded. This includes considering the extent to which proposed policy may impact (potential or actual) on the historical, cultural and spiritual interests of Ngāruahine within it rohe; and those areas under statutory acknowledgement and/or Deed of Recognition (Ngāruahine Claims Settlement Act 2016); and the potential or actual risks to the physical, psychological, cultural and spiritual wellness of Ngāruahine (Te Korowai o Ngāruahine Trust Deed).



4. The Ngāruahine hapū that will be affected by the proposed policy is Ōkahu-Inuāwai and Kanihi- Umutahi. Consultation has taken place with hapū in respect of this policy response. The comments in the submission do not affect the mana mohutake of the hapū, not prevent them from submitting comments in their own right.
5. TKONT has reviewed the proposed policy and provides a small number of observations.
6. We are pleased to see that Iwi and hapū are identified as an affected party (clause 6). We propose that any names provided by an affected party is granted a higher status than one that is proposed by an interested party. We also propose that iwi and hapū as mana whenua of the given area affords them a particular right in the road naming process.
7. Clause 9(c)(ix) of the policy states that 15 words are a suitable guideline. The stipulation may prejudice Māori who propose the full ancestral name of their tūpuna. TKONT would like assurances that a name exceeding 15 words would not be immediately discounted because of this.
8. TKONT is supportive of clause 8, which acknowledges the proposal of Māori names. But at another level, we are saddened by the need for the Policy to reference the selection of Māori names because it highlights the lack of integration of Māori language and culture to broader New Zealand culture.
9. Te Reo is an official language of Aotearoa New Zealand, and its revitalisation is actively supported and promoted by the Government. As part of this revitalisation, we suggest that Councils also have a role to play in normalising Te Reo as part of our everyday language. One way that the Council can support this kaupapa is the active promotion and encouragement of Māori road and place names. To this end we request that 50% of the names proposed should have a Māori association.



10. In regards to the road naming criteria (clause 9), TKONT would like to see the inclusion of policy statements that explicitly acknowledge the naming of roads in areas of significance to Māori, and that priority is given to this. Areas of significance are set out in each of the Iwi's statutory acknowledgements; we therefore suggest that these associations should give preference to iwi and hapū for the naming of the road. The inclusion of such statements would serve as a strong commitment to re-dress many of the wrongs of the past and recognise a re-assertion of our mana and tino rangatiritanga.

11. Regarding the District specific criteria (clause 9a) TKONT also proposes that the Policy include decision making criteria the following criteria to support clause 9(a)(i) and that road names:

- a. Recognise Māori cultural significance and heritage;
- b. Recognise significant historical events;
- c. Recognise cultural significance (other) and heritage;
- d. Honour local residents and tūpuna of the district; and / or
- e. Reflect the landscape and important topographical features.

12. With these additions, clause 9(a)(ii) is no longer required.

13. TKONT is disappointed that clause 13(a) offers Māori one opportunity from a selection of four names. As previously stated Te Reo is an official language of New Zealand and should be afforded no less than equal status within this policy. We propose that clause 13(a) removes the reference to iwi and hapū but clause 13(d) is amended to read something to the effect of, "Up to 50% of the final list will include Māori road names, where provided."

14. One matter that is not addressed by the Policy is how the Council proposes to attend to those areas of statutory overlapping interest. For Ngāruahine, we overlap with Te Atiawa. We suggest that Council need to be mindful of this when engaging iwi and hapū as affected parties.



15. In conclusion, TKONT thanks the New Plymouth District Council for the opportunity to comment on the proposed policy. We suggest that the Policy is a strong foundation, and with further recognition and protection of the the history and cultural interests of Māori along with the statutory interests of local iwi within the policy there is an opportunity to embed bi-culturalism within the Council policy.

16. Thank you for accepting these comments; we trust that they are helpful. Please contact me regarding our enquiries at policy@ngaruahine.iwi.nz.

Naku iti noa, nā

Louise Tester (PhD)
Kairangahau Matua (Social Initiatives and Policy Manager)

cc Kanihi-Umutahi hapū
Okahu-Inuawai hapū
Te Kotahitanga o Te Atiawa