

Attachment B

<h2>Summary of Submissions</h2>
--

Naming Policy Response to Public Submissions

Support naming policy

Topic number	Topic summarised	Topic	Response
1	General support	All 10 submissions supported the naming policy in general.	Noted
2	Conforms with NSW Heritage Council Policy	The policy acknowledges our shared past, and commemorates the City's heritage values, according to the philosophy of the NSW Heritage Council's Policy on <i>Place Names of Heritage Value</i> .	Noted
3	Conforms with Geographical Names Board policy	Good that Geographical Names Board policies and principles are referenced	Noted

Purpose

Topic number	Topic summarised	Topic	Response
	Names are a meaningful part of our cultural narrative	Suggest adding "Names also help shape the way a community operates. They are a very meaningful part of our cultural narrative"	Captured in "define places, and are part of our community's identity"

Context

Topic number	Topic summarised	Topic	Response
	Acknowledgement of invasion	"The Eora had named their land long before the British invaded and usurped the landscape, re-naming it for their own cultural sensibilities." Sentence is divisive and unconstructive choice of words	This wording was crafted in consultation with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Advisory Panel's Naming Policy Working Group and adopted by the Panel.

Name allocation or change

Topic number	Topic summarised	Topic	Response
	Significant community interest	How is “significant community interest” defined?	Policy is not prescriptive; each naming proposal considered by staff according to policy conformance and public feedback; and balanced against public impact and expense in naming changing.
	Language reinforces cultural values	Language, including names, is powerful tool which reinforces cultural values and can influence how we treat each other	Noted

Naming Principles

Topic number	Topic summarised	Topic	Response
	Principle 3 – local or cultural relevance	Names should include language that communicates the ‘spirit of place’ and how we aspire to treat people	Captured in ‘cultural relevance’
	Principle 4 – Aboriginal names & dual names	Five submissions strongly supported dual naming and Aboriginal naming	Noted
	Principle 4 – Aboriginal names & dual names	Explain the Aboriginal language words so people in the City comprehend the depth of the language	Operational issue; addressed in individual naming proposals, park signage and in streets guide
	Principle 5 – multicultural & gender diversity	Two submissions encouraged gender equity in naming	Operational issue; this is the spirit of the policy
	Principle 7 - eminent persons	Support names should only be applied posthumously	This is the spirit of the policy
	Principle 7 – eminent persons	A living name register could be kept for potential community people to be commemorated by names posthumously	Operational issue.
	Principle 7 – eminent persons	Consider naming places after well-known people associated with broad mindedness and social justice	Operational issue; this is the spirit of the policy

	Principle 8 – people in public office	Names should only to be applied posthumously	Addressed in principle 7
	Principle 11 – road name duplication	Geographical Names Board policy has shifted slightly due to council amalgamations. Now just same or adjoining locality and a 10km radius. But the Geographical Names Board encourage no duplication.	Noted. Keep current principle as better to aspire to no duplication from emergency services perspective
	Principle 15 – GNB principles	Geographical Names Board have recently adopted a new Place Naming Policy.	Add in reference to Place Naming Policy

Responsibilities

Topic number	Topic summarised	Topic	Response
	Private roads	Point 4 – private roads naming process follows a similar process to public roads but is not gazetted. It is submitted to Geographical Names Board and noted on the register as approved (not gazetted). Geographical Names Board recommend removing the word “gazetted”.	Remove “and gazetted” from the end of point 4.

Policy review period

Topic number	Topic summarised	Topic	Response
	Policy review timeframe	Should be five year review instead of ten.	Typographical error in text - corrected. Review period table was corrected to four years to align with the City’s policy management processes