



Wilson Drive Master Planning



Focus Groups and Community Workshops
May-June 2010

Village of Shorewood, WI

Wilson Drive Master Planning Focus Groups and Community Workshops

To solicit input on the Wilson Drive planning process, the Village of Shorewood held a series of focus groups with targeted audiences, as well as community workshops for all interested residents.

This packet includes the general feedback received from these sessions:

Session	Date	Location	Page
(1) General Shorewood Residents Focus Group	May 4, 2010	Village Hall	3
(2) Wilson Dr. Apartment Owners Focus Group	May 5, 2010	Village Hall	5
(3) Neighboring Residents Focus Group	May 5, 2010	Library	6
(4) Environmental Activists Focus Group	May 7, 2010	Village Hall	8
(5) Community Workshop #1	May 10, 2010	Village Center	10
(6) Developers Focus Group	May 19, 2010	Village Hall	13
(7) Realtors Focus Group	May 26, 2010	Village Hall	14
(8) Community Workshop #2	June 1, 2010	Village Center	15
Attachment A – Priority categories			

At each meeting, Mark and Linda Keane, consultants to the Wilson Drive Master Plan, made an introductory presentation on the impetus and goals behind the plan. The meetings were then open to discussion as participants stated their priorities, questions and concerns with the plan.

General Residents Focus Group – May 4, 2010

A focus group of general Shorewood residents was held on Tuesday, May 4th at the Village Hall Committee Room. The following participants were in attendance: Laura Drexler, Philip Gruber, Russ Klisch, Sue Evans, Linda Maki, Jim Maki, Deborah Sobczak, Jeff Schmeckpeper, Robert Peschel, Stephen McCarthy, and Vince Ferrara.

Also included were moderators Mark Keane and Linda Keane Village Manager Chris Swartz, Village President Guy Johnson and CDA Chair Pete Petrie.

General comments as part of the presentation were:

- River Brook site should be a development priority over Wilson Drive
- Maintain the substantial trees along Wilson Drive. Concern about the trees that were lost as part of the Capitol bridge work
- Disturbance of wild life is a concern
- Transition to Whitefish Bay is an important design concept
- Concern about road width and changing traffic patterns, i.e., people would not like the fact that they would have to slow down and utilize other neighborhood roads
- Quality of life and park safety are important aspects that should be considered in the design
- Welcoming entrances at the park should be a priority (not the Congress underground access). Welcoming entrance into Shorewood is also important
- Should there be a development element, it should be architecturally consistent and fit it to the natural setting of the background
- Very creative concept
- Should also work with developments across the street for upgrades
- Innovative storm water management is important
- Family friendly is not the only way to look
- Development is not necessarily imperative to include the other “non economic” benefits of the plan. Development can result in the Village losing its ability to control the type of development that is desired by the Village, i.e. developers wants x and the Village needs the development to pay the TIF, so standards are compromised
- Partnerships with the County are essential; social interaction aspects of the design are very important as well

Mark and Linda asked to rank priorities for Wilson Drive with respect to: Environmental education, Tax base, and Environmental stewardship/Health. The participants thought that Quality of Life and School enrollment should be added to the discussion criteria.

Each participant was asked to rank their priorities and or make their summary comments:

Participant I. The issue of increasing enrollment requires that this project has a sense of urgency. This is a substantial opportunity for the Village of Shorewood.

Participant II. Senior Housing and Assisted living development opportunities should be the Village priorities.

Participant III. This discussion brought to my attention that we have an Olmstead designed park in Shorewood; the same person who designed Central Park. Access, especially inviting pedestrian access, would be a substantial benefit to the community. Just as the current design along the Bike trail is a barrier to the park, we don't want housing to be a barrier. Improved access and neighborhood connection is important. Commerce Street was not developed correctly. Some commercial aspects may help neighborhood activity.

Participant IV. In order of preference, Quality of Life, Tax Base, School enrollment and Environment. Concerned about traffic and marketability of homes.

Participant V. Quality of Life and development are two top priorities. Single family homes are preferred strongly over apartments (concerned of marketability across the street from apartments). Maximize open space (lower density) Activating the street is an important benefit. It's a dead end now. The plan concept will improve neighborhood values

Participant VI. Quality of Life and Environment are the two top priorities. Concerned about the development aspect. It is not necessary, except that it helps pay the bills. However, if it's not marketable, general funds will pay for the improvements anyway. Prefers that development is not a pre-requisite for the plan. There are many other benefits that could be funded by the general fund.

Participant 7. "The idea is brilliant". "Would not have thought about this." Quality of Life, Enrollment and declining school enrollment should be the priorities. Family friendly housing is important. It must be "done right". Agrees that there should be urgency to this project. Concerned about loss of wild life.

Participant 8. Tax Base, Environmental and Quality of Life are the three priorities for this design. More pragmatic, parking will not work for commercial development on new green space; not appropriate. Important to have right design of development to complement the park background.

Note: Three participants left before finalizing their individual ideas.

Apartment Owners Focus Group – May 5, 2010

A focus group of apartment owners on Wilson Dr. was held on Wednesday, May 5th at the Village Hall Committee Room. The meeting was facilitated by Village Manager, Chris Swartz. All apartment owners in the project area were invited to attend; two apartment owners were in attendance. Chris presented the initial project concepts; the owners generally liked the project and were in agreement with the goals.

Neighboring Residents Focus Group – May 5, 2010

A focus group of neighboring residents who own single-family homes was held on Wednesday, May 5th at the Library Program Room. The following participants were in attendance: Margaret Goul, Lou Maris, Gina S. Szablewski, Joel Rast, Angie Kolanko, Chris Kolanko, Gerri Diedrich, Pat Krieger, Margaret Roche, Ann McKaig (Friends of Estabrook Park), and Mary Jo McDonald.

Also included were moderators Mark Keane, Linda Keane, and Village Manager Chris Swartz.

During the presentation by Linda and Mark Keane, the following comments (paraphrased and summarized) were made:

- Safety is a concern by opening up the park, i.e., there will be an element who will have easier access to the neighborhood from the park. Discussion was held on if there really was an “element in the park”, and that a more active park and street would deter crime in the neighborhood. (Let's get data on crime in the park from our police department)
- Less asphalt is a positive thing
- Narrowing the road and utilizing traffic calming techniques will detour traffic to wider roads in the Village of Shorewood. A traffic study should be done. The Village should also review if there are road standards that must be met via the DOT
- Development should not occur and boulevards should be considered rather than narrowing the road
- Increased green space is important
- Existing bushes, plantings, trees support many birds and other wild life
- Blue hole views should be blocked
- Entrances into the park from capitol will continue, even if there is better access
- “When I am on the Trail or Wilson Drive, I don't think River” The river is below grade
- Development mass should be consistent to what is across the street
- Not in favor of development
- Some of the images of the opening to the park looked to “groomed”, need to leave as natural as possible. There was some disagreement on this point
- Need to know about the type of housing that is proposed

As part of the formal comments on the presentation Linda and Mark Keane asked the group to rank the following master plan priorities: Environmental Stewardship/Health, Increasing enrolment/tax base, Park access, and Quality of Life.

Participant I. Narrowing the road and creating better access are the two priorities that are important. Development and tax base is not important, but could accept a limited amount if it could help student enrollment. Skeptical about use of TIF.

Participant II. Park access and environmental stewardship are the main priorities. Development is a low priority; its like privatizing park land. As a “birdist”, I am concerned impact of birds with changing Wilson Drive and creation development.

Participant III. Park access is the highest priority. Intrigued about the development potential if its done tastefully and blended in the neighborhood, i.e., Edgewood. There should be a balance between Environmental stewardship and Tax base. Hard to blend 1950s apartments with new housing.

Participant IV. Access to Park is the most important, i.e., bike and walk to park . Project requires an inclusive process. Could support some limited development toward the Southern end of Wilson. Preference would be to find other methods of increasing school enrollment.

Participant V. Park access is important. Improving aesthetics, play areas/tot lots along Wilson Drive, rather than within Estabrook Park Environmental stewardship is also important. Must be careful about development; not sure if it's a good idea. Don't add sub-standard housing.

Participant VI. Like the idea of a community process; don't look at this in a vacuum. Must understand the Estabrook Park is not Shorewood's; its the entire community. There are so many partners that should be involved in this. Balance and partnerships are important. There are many groups who are interested in this, including Friends of Estabrook Park.

Participant VII. Tax base is important. Safety, which is part of Quality of Life is very important. Don't want the project to result in neighborhood safety problems. Increased street parking is also a big concern. There are inadequate parking facilities for the area. Must fix current sewer back up problems in basin 6 as a priority and possibly look at fixing them as part of this project if possible. Balanced development is possible; don't know up the use of TIF however.

Participant VIII. No building. Don't narrow the road, utilize boulevards. If narrow the road someone might want to develop. Safety is the most important; opening up the park may result in more crime and need for more police. Environmental stewardship is important.

The other three participants had to leave early. One of the participants were against development during the discussion period. The Village Manager received a call from a participant the day after, who supported the project concept.

Environmental Focus Group – May 7, 2010

A focus group of environmental activists was held on Friday, May 7th at the Village Hall Court Room. The following participants were in attendance: Ann Brummit, Ann McKaig, Glen Fredlund, Bill Hilther, Kathy Yanoff, Gretchen Mead, Kim Forbeck, Tammy Bockhorst, Michael Maher, Keith Schmitz.

Also included were moderators Mark Keane, Linda Keane, and Village Manager Chris Swartz.

After the presentation, Mark Kean asked each participant to provide their priorities on the following basis: Environmental Stewardship, Park Access, Tax Base/School Enrollment, Other.

Participant I. Environmental Stewardship was number 1, followed by Park access and then tax base/school enrollment. The plan should explore interesting and sustainable ways to development, if in fact development is part of the plan. Concern for intrusion on the bike trail natural views and flora and fauna. There are trade offs

Participant II. Environmental stewardship is first and foremost. A County partnership is the key to this project. Preservation and restoration are key elements. There has to be a realization that there will be destruction before restoration with any project of this nature. Park Access is second most important with Tax base being third in importance. We have to be fiscally responsible.

Participant III. There are many questions that cannot be answered today. Instead of a narrower road, why not a boulevard. Does not feel that there is a barrier. Not convinced that development is appropriate. Loves the bike path and taking pictures of the Flora and Fauna on the and around the bike path. Reducing green space is not desirable. Also, who's green space is it. If it's private space, then we lose green space. Problem with turning public green space into private green space.

Participant 4. Ok with narrowing the road and Park Access is important. Is not in favor of development. They don't allow development along Central Park because the back doors would be to the park. The development is across the street so the front doors face the park. If you put development along the trail, the backdoors would face the park, like an alley way. Not good design.

Participant 5. Street needs to be narrowed. Park Access and Environmental stewardship are important. Not sold on the need for development, however school enrollment is important. Possibly a small phased in development? Would not like to see a full development plan. Public gardens may be an appropriate use of additional green space.

Participant 6. There may be a missing priority here; long term sustainability. Cannot look at today, must look at future with regards to transportation, energy, water, climate change, food safety, public gardens, etc. The larger sustainability policy must be the priority. Also, maybe the Village could look at green industry as a way to diversify the tax base. The cultural aspect of the plan should also be included, i.e., biking culture (Biking bed and breakfast idea came up). Assure sustainability is embedded in the plans.

Participant 7. Support narrowing of Wilson. Increase access points and "flattening" them. Environmental sustainability is important as well. Ok with development if done correctly and is not solid development. There needs to be a balance between Natural and mowed areas. The natural areas are very important to sustainability. Storm water management must be done correctly. Must be respectful of Estabrook park. Development must be carefully planned and not dictated by a developer.

Participant 8. Wilson Drive is an eye sore. Difficult and unsafe for children to get there. Access points can flood, which created dangers. Access is # 1 priority. Increase access to park in an environmentally sensitive way and any development in a family friendly way. Like idea of

improving property stock for families, but not sure this concept will address the need. Must be managed well. Needs some incredible oversight or Commission. Access to bike path is vital.

Participant 9. Access is the 1 priority. Don't want to see solid housing like Commerce street. Look at adding road access.

Other discussion occurred after participants provided their priorities, as summarized below:

1. What other uses of land are possible, other than development, gardens, trees, prairie grasses, etc.
2. Should look at a produce stand in the Village of Shorewood
3. The planning process needs to include many discussions and be inclusionary.
4. Could Shorewood investigate new ways to build/integrate housing stock?

Community Workshop – May 10, 2010

A Wilson Drive Master Plan Community Workshop was held on May 10, 2010. The workshop consisted of a presentation by Mark Kean and Linda Keane, consultants to the plan, and then a design Charrette. This workshop activity included tables grouped with 5-8 participants commenting on the project and then designing on a “mock up” map of the Wilson Drive Planning area ideas related to sever design variables as attached to this cover letter.

The participants were primarily from the Wilson Drive neighborhood, although the meeting was for the entire community. The following people signed in for the meeting:

Name	Address
Mary Jo and Judy Zachow	Maryland
Dan Ford	Woodburn
John and Karen deHartog	Sheffield
Julianna	River Park Ct
Cheryl Toll	Alpine
Mike and Beth Sauer	Glendale
Harvey Rabinowitz	
Fran and David Luck	Alpine
Lois Wesener	Kenmore
Tom Chapman	Larkin
Mike Maher	Menlo
Ellen Eckman	Beverly
Patrick Linnane	Beverly
Jeff Hanewall	
Chris Kolanko	Woodruff
Michael Hunsicker	Alpine

There were four tables staffed by either Mark or Linda Keane, Trustee Maher, Trustee Jeff Hanewall and Trustee Pat Linnane, Harvey Rabinowitz (volunteer) and Trustee Eckmann. The groups discussed the project for approximately 1.5 hours.

The feedback: Overall, most participants liked the idea of opening up the Park and narrowing the road, however, there was only pockets of support for development, primarily due to compromising the Natural Vistas while utilizing the bike path, driving or walking on Wilson Drive.

Discussion by Tables:

Table I. Trustee Eckmann reporting.

- Opening up the park and narrowing the road was good idea
- More people in the park
- Diamond in the Rough
- No houses, but boulevards to narrow road
- Some areas on Wilson may be proper for housing(South end by Capitol)
- Coffee shop, food, B&B would work by Capitol or at Glendale to serve the Bike enthusiast.
- Farmers market in park
- Traffic at 5:00 p.m. is a concern if it would be narrowed.
- Expand duplex program to encourage more families
- Co-housing and senior housing near Capitol
- Pergolas and places to sit are important
- Washington Highlands, example of housing near park; adds neighborhood value

- Green space tied to Coffee Shop
- Access should be nicely landscaped
- Reduce water in ditches
- Tunnel on Congress is a problem
- Wider Bike Trail
- Should be a Renaissance period for Wilson and the Park
- Victory gardens in the additional green space
- More use of sports fields
- Close Wilson with cul du sacs(increase development and lower cost of road).

Table II. Trustee Maher reporting:

- Narrowing Wilson and making it smaller and more pleasant to walk around
- Create regular green areas for park access at Glendale, Congress, Wildwood and Olive. Connect Shorewood to Park activities.
- Make gateways at Glendale for fishing/biking, B&B
- Allow green space in-between development at a smaller scale
- Communicate progress of plan
- Lose the tunnel
- Keep bike path as natural as possible/buffer bike path from Wilson
- Phase a development plan, highlight the narrowing of Wilson and green park access, not the development
- Develop the ends, phase middle.
- Nervous about development
- Gateway to the community
- Park access is important
- "In support of plan"
- Improve trail connections
- Olive, Congress, Glendale and Wildwood for access
- Make park access connect to amenities in the park
- Speed limit should remain the same
- Wider bike trail

Table III. Trustee Hanewall reporting:

- Aesthetic issue of Development; natural edge, not a developed edge.
- Bump-out parking is dangerous
- Width should be narrower due to safety and cost considerations
- Width should accommodate accessibility and aesthetics; could have boulevard
- Open park for visual connection as well as bike and pedestrian traffic
- Develop South end with business and housing
- Any development should be very green
- Development should not compete with existing businesses
- Skepticism of "family friendly" site

Table 4. Resident Dave Luck reporting (plus notes)

- Question about where Keanes live and if they are paid
- Environmental progressive is important
- Is the proposal 58" to 32 ft"
- Any study made on traffic impact, especially if you deter use for those who want to commute downtown, i.e., it will slow traffic whereby people will not want to utilize Wilson to commute.
- Is street width a "done deal"

- Is grant proposal due in July and therefore the Village is trying to complete a master plan in this time period
- Urban gardens would be a good idea.
- Security is an important issue. Does opening up access create security problems?
- Open space is important
- Access to the park at a point closest to the River
- Conceal site lines to blue hole
- Questions on TIF use
- Fountains would be a great amenity
- Staged housing if any
- Coffee shop
- Bridge over County road in park coinciding with Shorewood entries on the East side of the road.
- Very limited housing (opposite ends, not in middle).

Developers Focus Group – May 19, 2010

A focus group of developers was held on Wednesday, May 19th at the Village Hall Committee Room. Mike Slavish from Hovde Properties was the only developer in attendance, but the Village Manager had also discussed the project with developers who were not able to attend. General comments from the developers on the project:

- Duplexes may be better than four-plexes –less density may be more desirable/marketable
- Underground parking will be more desirable than garages from an aesthetic standpoint
- If duplexes are developed, they should look like separate units rather than two doors in the center
- A developer may not even be necessary – if structured right, the project may just need a builder
- Market and financing still the biggest issues with condominiums

Real Estate Focus Group – May 26, 2010

A focus group of real estate professionals was held on Wednesday, May 26th at the Village Hall Committee Room. The meeting was facilitated by Village Manager, Chris Swartz. Eight realtors were in attendance. Chris presented the initial project concepts.

Realtor input included:

General feedback

- Ideal housing is twindominiums: side-by-side ranch style townhomes, 1800 sf. Two-level townhomes not ideal for “empty nester” market
- European style row houses and Brown Stones are appropriate
- If green building, understand what market is willing to pay

Benefits

- good for starter homes and for the market segment “not quite ready for suburban”
- People will buy to be close to the Oak Leaf Trail
- Narrowing and improving street
- Improve access to Estabrook Park
- Connecting road to neighborhood

Concerns

- Safety- negative perception of Estabrook Park
- Negative perception of apartments
- Affordability-should be around \$250,000 (no basement?)
- Will not attract families if no back yard
- One- and two-family homeowners will not purchase adjacent to multifamily housing
- Value of new development dependent on vitality of existing multifamily housing
- Addition of curb cut-outs could produce more accidents, as what happened on Locust St. (near Farwell)
- Parking- important to have 2 cars

Community Workshop #2 – June 1, 2010

Wilson Drive Master Plan Community Workshop #2 was held on June 1, 2010 at the Village Center. Mark and Linda Keane discussed the results of the focus groups and presented potential concept plans for Wilson Drive. Workshop activity included tables grouped with 5-8 participants commenting on the project.

There were four tables staffed by either Mark or Linda Keane, Trustee Maher, Trustee Jeff Hanewall and Trustee Hickey, Trustee Eckmann, and Sean Cummings. The groups discussed the project for approximately 1.5 hours.

The feedback: Like the first community workshop, most participants liked the idea of opening up the Park and narrowing the road, however, there was only pockets of support for development, primarily due to compromising the Natural Vistas.

Discussion by Tables:

Table I. Trustee Maher reporting.

- Concern for snow storage on the site
- Concerned that duplexes will not attract families – Shorewood already has a lot of affordable housing
- What will be the impact on value of the east of Wilson Dr.?
- What is going to happen to the park?
- Flood prevention/protection – what would be the impact on possible flooding?
- We should be going after commercial development.
- Not sold on the idea of row houses/duplex
- Interested in wildlife in the park. 114 species of birds use the park. Maintain the green corridor. Very little green spaces left in urban areas.
- Like narrowing the road.
- Concerned about safety of children accessing the park.
- Concerned about neglect of the park. Invasive species are taking over.
- Park has a deeper value.
- Concerned about loss of vegetation to create vista.
- Snow dump is destroying the vegetation.
- The Village and County have neglected the parkway.
- Too much visual impact for users of the bike path.
- Keep as much green as possible.
- More bikers with views will create more views into the neighbors windows.
- A lot of existing rentals already on Wilson and the side streets. Would like high-end and only owner-occupied so we do not increase the non-owner occupied units.
- Not enough green space. Concerned about the impact on trail.
- Where are the cars going to park?
- We do not want “Commerce Street.”
- With the park improvements, this adds value to neighborhood blocks and quadrant.
- Too much development. Will need study of impact of park improvements on the value of existing housing.
- How do you preserve that “cathedral” feeling along the bike trail.
- Visual and pedestrian connection to park concerns
- Narrowing of Wilson a positive
- Calming traffic a positive.
- Keeping green bike corridor/canopy is positive and needed.
- We do not want big open space, prefer just letting space be green.
- Keep it native plantings with multiple stories.

- Leave space for wildlife
- Concerned about the timeline

- Put more information on the village website.
- Do wildlife impact analysis

Table II.

- Housing with no yards – how does that bring in families?
- Likes accessibility to park
- Doesn't want row of houses or any fences
- Like entrances open
- Accessibility issue – how do you cross the bike path
- Safety issue
- Likes cuts into parkway – how to get parking between trees – Wilson trees are young
- Likes open accessibility
- Wary of housing – but will this help schools?
- Doesn't want town houses
- More green in between
- Access now is not safe
- Is this too narrow?
- In favor of planned unit development – strict guidelines
- Increase access – not every east/west st. should go into park – Glendale, Olive, Congress
- DPW snow storage issue
- Concerned about parking
- Narrowing Wilson – agrees that shouldn't be too narrow
- Homes not row houses
- Openings into park
- Likes trees as view
- green – no real estate
- not sure narrowing Wilson helps speeding problems - Morris and Menlo are narrow and still a speedway
- Doesn't think anyone would like 1,000 sq ft starter homes
- 20% housing max
- 40 houses or less, separated
- Single family houses
- No UWM students - Already surrounded by UWM students
- Prefer green
- Who will housing appeal to?
- Playground should be visible from Wilson
- More landscape based playground
- Benches with view sites – to stop at when biking

Table III. Chris Swartz reporting from notes left on concept plan.

- Rework dangerous intersection of Glendale and Wilson
- Wanted to know rental rates in Shorewood
- Wanted to know how many houses for sale
- Questions about kids in houses along Oak Leaf Trail
- Concerned about capacity of Oak Leaf Trail and through it should be widened—first concern should be width of bike path before land is destroyed
- Should create significant noise barrier due to traffic noise
- Community gardens in boulevards instead of narrowing the road
- Widen bike path to allow more pedestrian traffic

- Use boulevard concept to make environmental friendly spaces where neighbors could garden and maintain
- Berms with trees and bushes in the boulevard; don't need extensive curbing
- Keep new green areas natural—no lawns!
- Use current empty spaces before destroying green spaces
- Additional bike path entry way with street signs for street locations (on path)
- Roads, housing, and parking are bad. Bikers and greenway good. Ban cars.
- Too much focus on mowed surfaces.
- Add community garden
- Save mature trees
- Pocket stormwater rain garden
- Access for vehicles to the park
- What about snow storage?
- Species management; invasive undesirable
- More active sports within the new greenspace
- Add walking/running path to businesses
- Free bikes (zip bikes)
- Study multi-use of Oak Leaf Trail
- Will security of new homes be an issue?
- Grant money available for a "green street"
- Green buildings important
- Bio-retentions swales with curb cuts
- Build in swales and rain gardens
- Reduce pipe design by managing storm water on site
- Rent park parking for Wilson Dr. apartments
- Excellent land use proposal
- Move American Legion

General comments on the concept plan:

- Not in favor of row houses or duplexes
- Maintain left turn access north and south bound
- Bed & Breakfast desired near Capitol Drive
- No homes
- Enhanced landscape
- Community gardens
- Interactive landscaping
- More signage
- Remove invasives
- Fitness training
- See madisonenvironmentalgroup.com – planning unit housing – Euro design

ATTACHMENT A



Wilson Avenue Village Design Workshop

Environmental Stewardship Village Tax Base Schools/State Aid Park Access

- Park Access
 - Location along Wilson
 - Pedestrian
 - Bike
 - Vehicular
 - Trail Links
 - Grade, below, above

- Views
 - To Park
 - To River edge
 - Along Wilson
 - Across Wilson
 - Poor Views

- Plant life
 - Existing
 - Future growth
 - Urban Agriculture

- Wildlife
 - Existing
 - Future options

- Village image
 - Gateway from north
 - Sustainable
 - Pedestrian

- Housing
 - Single Family
 - Rowhouses
 - Townhomes
 - Apartments
 - Co-housing

- Commerce
 - Food sales
 - Coffee shop
 - B + B
 - Offices
 - Live/Work

- Street
 - Width
 - Parking
 - Crosswalks
 - Landscape
 - Lighting
 - Bus stops
 - Stormwater management

- Parking
 - On-Street
 - On-Site
 - One story underground
 - Garden level underground