

Feilding Town Centre Refresh Engagement Theming Summary In total 766 responses were received during the Feilding Town Centre Refresh (FTCR) engagement. Not all respondents answered every question.

- **Cover over Brick Quadrant :** Of 753 respondents, 171 (22.7%) supported the proposed covered community space, while 582 (77.3%) did not support it.
- **Planting preference:** Of 349 respondents, 224 (64.1%) preferred Option 2, 125 (35.6%) preferred Option 1.
- **One-way traffic changes:** Of 710 respondents, 437 (61.5%) supported the changes, 273 (38.4%) did not support the changes.
- **Additional parking improving access:** Of 696 respondents, 470 (67.5%) considered that additional parking would improve access, while 226 (32.5%) did not.

Key messages:

- **Covered over Brick Quadrant:** The most frequently recurring themes were opposition to the structure, the cost and priority of essential services, and desire to retain the Square's openness and character. Supportive comments focussed on reliable shelter, seating, and opportunities to activate the town centre. However, many respondents questioned whether a permanent structure would generate sufficient additional use.
- **Planting:** Option 2 was preferred by 64.1% of respondents who answered the question, although open-space flexibility, access and maintenance were relevant concerns.
- **Road Changes:** A majority supported the one-way changes; however, comments focussed heavily on parking, traffic effects, vehicle speeds, car-park dimensions, pedestrian safety, and consultation with local businesses.

Cover over Brick Quadrant:

Theme counts are non-exclusive; one contribution may be coded to several themes.

Responses	Theme	Comments
370	Opposition to proceeding / preference to retain the square as is	Many comments asked Council not to proceed, or to retain Manchester Square as an open flexible community space.
317	Cost, affordability and preference for Council to prioritise of essential services	Respondents questioned the expense and ongoing costs, affordability for ratepayers, and whether funding should instead support core infrastructure and services.
377	Openness of the structure, CBD character, heritage, and visual fit	Concerns focussed on the scale and restrictive nature of the structure, its sawtooth and industrial appearance, and whether it was compatible with Feilding's established Edwardian character.
113	Weather protection, markets, and event use	Positive comments addressed genuine shelter and reliable all-weather event use, as well as whether a permanent structure would materially increase use.

119	Design alternatives, location or less-permanent options	Suggestions included simpler roof forms, shade sails, pergola or temporary covers, a rotunda-style structure, or using existing and alternative venues, e.g., Manfeild, Civic Centre, Community Halls.
104	Roof engineering, drainage and ongoing maintenance	Concerns included internal gutters and valleys, debris, leaks, heat, acoustics, structural supports, cleaning, and whole-of-life maintenance.
135	Safety, security and anti-social behaviour	Respondents questioned safety, vandalism, graffiti, rough sleeping, loitering, the need for lighting and cameras and concerns for who would manage this.
97	Planting, landscaping and green-space preferences	Views varied between additional gardens and greenery, retaining more flexible grass/open space, and minimising planting that could obstruct access or increase maintenance.
91	Accessibility, seating and event/vendor logistics	Feedback covered accessibility, mobility parking, seating, vendor loading, power, storage and practical event infrastructure.
64	Consultation, local involvement and governance	Respondents asked Council to listen to the community and user feedback, involve local designers and businesses, and clarify who would govern the structure and control event management.
98	Effects on nearby businesses and town-centre activity	Potential benefits included increased visitation and activity in the CBD; concerns included visibility for businesses, competition, and reduced event/vendor flexibility.
17	Environmental and sustainability opportunities	Solar generation was proposed along with water-storage tanks, electric-vehicle charging stations, reduction of generator use and providing improved rubbish facilities.

Positive design features identified by respondents:

Responses	Theme	Comments
84	Covered space, weather protection and all-weather use	Shelter from rain and wind, greater certainty for activities and the ability to use the space throughout the year.
62	Markets, events and community activation	Support for the Farmers' Market, performances and community events; attracting people into town; and creating a more active community space.
44	Overall design, appearance and welcoming character	The modern, attractive or welcoming appearance, including comments that the design looked natural, picturesque or compatible with the library or Feilding's character.
31	Flexible, open and adaptable space	An open and spacious structure capable of accommodating different activities, layouts and user groups.
27	Roof form, materials, natural light and local character	The saw-tooth roof, timber elements, high roof, natural light and connections with Feilding's rural, industrial or heritage character.
23	Planting, landscaping and stormwater treatment	Positive comments about gardens, grass, landscaping, softened edges and the use of planting to manage stormwater runoff.
18	Moveable screening and weather adaptability	Moveable walls, panels and windbreaks that could be opened or closed according to weather conditions.

13	Seating, kiosk/storage, lighting and energy features	Seating, event storage, the kiosk, integrated and natural lighting.
11	Access, pedestrian comfort and inclusive use	User-friendly access, mobility access, pedestrian comfort, inclusive gathering space and places where people could stay and socialise.

Proposed road changes feedback: Advantages

Responses	Theme	Comments
45	Improved traffic flow and easier passage.	The most common perceived benefit was that one-way operation would remove opposing-vehicle conflicts on streets described as narrow, awkward or difficult to drive through, particularly when large vehicles were parked.
16	Safer and clearer movement.	Respondents expected fewer vehicle conflicts (e.g., trying to pass on narrow streets or manoeuvring around large, parked cars and oncoming traffic), better visibility and a safer environment for drivers and pedestrians. Several respondents described the current arrangement as dangerous.
35	Additional or more usable parking.	Respondents anticipated more convenient access to shops, easier angle parking and benefit from additional loading or mobility spaces. Some support was conditional on bays being large enough for utes, SUVs, vans and door opening.
33	Better pedestrian access, accessibility and public space.	Respondents saw one-way operation as an opportunity for safe crossings, shorter crossing distances, wider or more comfortable pedestrian areas, accessible movement, seating and outdoor dining.
20	Support for businesses, activity and town-centre appeal.	Respondents expected easier access, added parking, and improved streetscapes to increase visitation, support local shops and create a more attractive or active town centre.
25	General endorsement without a detailed reason.	Some written responses simply described the road proposal or design as sensible, attractive, well considered or a good idea, without explaining a single benefit.

Proposed road changes feedback: Disadvantages

Responses	Theme	Comments
65	The current arrangement is adequate or change is unnecessary.	Respondents said that the existing system works well enough, that problems occur only occasionally, or that maintenance and small adjustments would be preferable to a redesign.
119	Cost, affordability, priority and value for money.	Respondents questioned whether the number of additional parks or likely transport benefits justified construction, disruption and ongoing costs. Many preferred essential infrastructure, maintenance, debt reduction or lower rates.
42	Confusion, detours, wrong-way movements and inconvenience.	Concerns included unfamiliar drivers entering the wrong way, confusion where one- and two-way sections meet, having to travel around the block, and reduced

		convenience when trying to reach a business or return to a parking space.
44	Congestion and redistribution to adjoining roads.	Respondents were concerned that circulating traffic, parking searches and diverted movements could create bottlenecks at nearby intersections or shift pressure to Kimbolton Road, Manchester Street, MacArthur Street, Stafford Street and other routes.
52	Angle-parking, reversing and large-vehicle safety.	Respondents were concerned that angle parking on both sides of narrow streets. Respondents described blocked sightlines, vehicle protruding into the carriageway, risks when two vehicles reverse at once, and bays that may be too short or narrow for large vehicles.
45	Existing parking is adequate or demand is Friday-specific.	Some respondents said they can usually park within a short walk, that shortages mainly occur on Fridays or for major events, or that enforcement and business-parking behaviour should be addressed before adding spaces.
24	Too few additional parks to materially improve access.	A related concern was that roughly nine to twelve additional spaces would not deliver noticeable benefit, particularly when event closures could remove them or other parking areas were available.
38	More pedestrian or seating space is not needed.	Respondents said footpaths were rarely congested; existing seating was underused and widening pedestrian areas could reduce space for traffic or parking without attracting more activity.
40	Effects on business access, deliveries and trading.	Respondents were concerned that one-way circulation and parking changes could make shops harder to reach, discourage customers or adversely affect trading. Other concerns included maintaining loading and delivery access, the availability of parking for customers and businesses, disruption during construction, and the need to consult affected business owners.
36	Loss of direct access for visitors, older people and mobility-limited users.	Some respondents considered circuitous routes and parking changes less accessible, particularly for people who need to park near their destination or who may find one-way layouts difficult to navigate.
6	Higher vehicle speeds on one-way streets.	Six respondents suggested that removing opposing traffic could encourage higher speeds. One supportive respondent suggested speed-control measures if the proposal proceeds.

Additional 22 responses provided on short forms

Response	Supported	Opposed	No Response
Proposed design	0 (0.0%)	20 (90.9%)	2 (9.1%)
Overall concept	3 (13.6%)	18 (81.8%)	1 (4.5%)

Themes

Responses	Theme	Comments
12	Retaining the Square's openness and existing character	Respondents wanted Manchester Square to remain open and largely unchanged. Comments referred to its distinctive character, identity and value as an open public space.

7	Appearance and compatibility of the proposed design	Comments described the proposed structure as unattractive, “tent-like” or out of character with the town centre and the Square’s existing aesthetic.
7	Cost, rates and value for money	Respondents questioned the project’s cost, its value and potential future maintenance costs. Some considered the funding should be directed to other priorities or were concerned about further pressure on rates.
5	Need, purpose and demonstrated benefit	Comments questioned why the change was required, whether the existing Square was already functioning adequately and whether there was sufficient identified use beyond the market.
3	Alternative location or use of existing venues	Respondents suggested locating the facility elsewhere or using existing venues such as the Civic Centre or Manfeild.
2	Use of local designers or providers	Questioned why design work had been undertaken outside the District and suggested local expertise should have been used.
2	Traffic and parking	Respondents raised existing Friday parking pressures and considered a facility should be located where parking and future growth could be accommodated.
2	Funding and operational conditions	Comments suggested users should contribute to costs and the need to secure the facility after hours.
2	Effects on existing features	Specific concerns included shading other parts of the Square and the relationship with existing trees and time capsules.
1	Design feature suggestion	One respondent referred to the inclusion or use of louvres