

**Greenwood Station Second Exit  
Local Working Group (LWG) Meeting #6  
March 7, 2018  
St. David's Church – Basement 6:30 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.**

**Meeting Purpose & Summary:**

On March 7, 2018, the TTC hosted the sixth meeting of the Greenwood Second Exit Local Working Group (LWG).

**Please note that TTC has not put forward, accepted or approved any of the locations that the LWG has put forward for review. No decisions have been made.**

Notification for the 2018 meeting schedule included:

- Addressed Mail via Canada Post.
- More than 800 properties in the local neighbourhood (January, 8, 2018).
- 35 local property owners with offsite mailing addresses via Canada Post (January, 8, 2018).
- Email to contact list of all who expressed previous interest (December 22, 2017 and again on January 9, 2018).
- Registered mail to each property owner whose property was put forward as a preliminary location option for discussion by the Local Working Group and/or other local residents or businesses owners (January 10, 2018).
- Registered mail to each property owner whose property was identified as an additional potential property impact during the functional review (January 18, 2018).
- TTC website update with notice of the 2018 meeting schedule (posted January 9, 2018).

There was discussion at the January 31, 2018 meeting about the TTC project team's flexibility in terms of fine-tuning locations put forward by the LWG, to attempt to potentially reduce the number of acquired properties for each location option/construction footprint.

To ensure this is done fairly, such an effort cannot single out one location. The Expert Panel confirmed that the same principle applies across the board.

The review of Option "A" (1366 Danforth Ave) was presented at the March 7, 2018 meeting:

**Option A** (1366 Danforth Avenue) requires acquisition of 257/259 Strathmore Boulevard, 1366/1370 Danforth Avenue and potentially 1364/1374 Danforth Avenue to construct.

A review was undertaken to attempt to reduce the property acquisitions for Option A. Option "A2" was reviewed.

**Option A2 (1370/1374 Danforth Avenue) - Not Carried Forward**

- Property impact to three more Strathmore homes where the new underground corridor is located (compared to Option A).
- The commercial property impacts would change, requiring the acquisition of 1370/1374 Danforth Avenue and potentially 1366/1376 Danforth Avenue

Unlike the refinement to "Option I", refining "Option A" would increase property impacts, and therefore is not carried forward.

**Cost**

TTC provided Order of Magnitude costs for all LWG location options.

**At this time the LWG has been provided with the information required in order to complete their rankings according to the evaluation framework process. All of the information required is located on the drawings provided. LWG members will submit their preliminary rankings to TTC by March 14, 2018.**

**LWG LOCATION OPTIONS CARRIED FORWARD FOR EVALUATION:**

- A. 1366 Danforth Avenue
- B. 1410/1416 Danforth Avenue - rear of property
- C. 1416 Danforth Avenue
- D. 7 Linnsmore Crescent
- E. 9 Linnsmore Crescent
- F. 11 Linnsmore Crescent
- G. 15 Linnsmore Crescent
- H. 138/140 Monarch Park Avenue
- I. 257/259 Strathmore Boulevard\*
- J. Strathmore Boulevard at Monarch Park Avenue Right-of-Way

**\* “Option I2” provides an opportunity to reduce the property impacts within the same construction footprint, therefore it is being carried forward for evaluation. “Option I” is not being carried forward.**

The LWG reviewed their location options and discussed the relative merits for each option using the Evaluation Framework categories.

Approximately 25 neighbours attended. A number of property owners and/or their representative shared their input with the LWG, their neighbours and TTC.

**Next Steps and Updated Schedule:**

The LWG will submit their preliminary rankings to the TTC by March 14, 2018.

The LWG will reconvene on March 21, 2018 to review and discuss their preliminary rankings of their location options. They will submit their final rankings individually via email to the TTC after the March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.

One additional LWG meeting will be held on April 11, 2018 for the LWG to discuss and finalize their rankings as a group.

The third party Expert Panel for second exits will ultimately review the Local Working Group’s rankings to ensure compliance with the evaluation framework.

A public meeting will then be held for the community to review the LWG’s overall rankings of the 10 locations, and give additional input to both the LWG and to the TTC.

Finally, TTC staff will report to the TTC Board on the LWG’s findings and the wider community’s input. The TTC Board will make a final decision on a second exit/entrance location for Greenwood Station.

**LWG Members in Attendance:**

- |                 |                    |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| Duncan Rowe     | Kathy Katsiroumpas |
| Oliver Hierlihy | Daphne Brown       |
| Brian Freeman   | Basil Mangano      |
| Alan Hahn       | Alison Behrend     |
| Grace Bosley    | Bruna Amabile      |
| Ian Scott       | Lily Chong         |
| Alison Motluk   |                    |
| Simon Mortimer  |                    |

**Regrets:**

- Pam Koch

**Neighbours in attendance**

Approximately 25 neighbours attended.

**Third Party Expert Panel on Second Exits:**

- Simon Rees

**TTC Staff:**

- Nada Zebouni
- David Nagler
- Kamran Ehsani
- Denise Jayawardene
- Lito Romano

**City Real Estate:**  
Patricia Palmieri

**City Councillor's Office**  
Rashid Katsina (Councillor Fragedakis's office)

\*\*\*\*\*

**Agenda:**

- Introductions
- Presentation & LWG Discussion
  - Update/Schedule
  - TTC review of locations, additional information requested
  - Costs Update
- Q&A with neighbours attending

**TTC Post Meeting Action Items:**

- TTC to post presentation and meeting notes on the Second Exit project website (completed).

**Meeting Question and Answer Summary:**

*Process Related Questions:*

- 1) Can new location options be added to the process at this time?

**A: No. The LWG has put forward 10 location options and must complete their rankings for these locations.**

- 2) Is it possible to build only an exit (and not an entrance)?

**A: TTC's policy is for all "second exits" to function as daily entrances to provide customer convenience. As TTC farelines are being replaced by bi-directional PRESTO faregates, retrofits to convert existing "exit-only" facilities to entrances is being implemented, such as at Pape Station. At Woodbine, there was significant desire by the local community for the second exit to function as an entrance. TTC would need Board approval to build any new second exit/entrance building as an "exit only".**

- 3) Does TTC have a preferred location or an upset cost limit, which would automatically remove some options from the evaluation now?

**A: No, TTC does not have a preferred location. There is a budget for the overall program. The TTC Board will make the final decision, including consideration of the cost, when reviewing the recommended option(s).**

**TTC Engineering has provided the technical information necessary for the local working group to rank their location options using the approved evaluation framework.**

*Location Questions*

- 4) Option B: 1410/1416 Danforth Avenue Rear and Option C: 1416 Danforth Avenue is located in almost the same location at street level, why do the drawings show two different pedestrian corridors? Does the TTC have flexibility to shift the corridor to Monarch Park Avenue front lawns/ROW?

**A: The project team depicted the shortest distance travelled underground for each option.**

**While it would be possible to construct either pedestrian corridor for both Option C and B, the pedestrian corridor in Option B (188 m) is longer than Option C (157 m) and does not provide an improvement in the distance travelled to exit. A few things to consider:**

- **A shorter and more direct route travelled underground is preferable. The project team depicted the shortest distance travelled underground for each option.**
- **Trees and landscaping on front lawns in the path of the underground corridors depicted in light blue on the drawings would need to be removed. New landscaping can be installed after construction, but is limited if it is directly over an underground structure. After a location is determined, TTC will hire a professional arborist as part of the engineering design process and will coordinate with City Forestry and property owners.**

Small structures, like garages, can be rebuilt on top of the pedestrian corridor/underground infrastructure.

*Budget Questions:*

- 5) In Option B (1410/1416 Danforth Ave REAR), is the full Money Mart building also required as part of the costs?

**A: No.**

- 6) In Option A, is the cost for the acquiring the properties that were identified as a potential impact included in the budget?

**A: No, however a contingency allowance was provided. Further investigations of these buildings (1364 and 1374 Danforth Avenue) would be required to confirm any impacts.**

- 7) Option E & F have different corridor lengths. Why is the cost listed in the \$18-19M range?

**A: The costs for both options fall within the range provided.**

- 8) Can TTC confirm with City Planning/EMS/Transportation how many parking spaces are typically removed in front of a TTC station?

**A: Not as this stage. Every existing second exit/entrance location in the City differs and the exact number of parking spots that may be removed cannot be determined at this stage. City Transportation will make the final decision. Typically at second exit/entrance buildings (such as on Markham Road for Bathurst Station and on Emerson Avenue at Lansdowne Station), there are small “no parking” zones directly outside the buildings. However, every location is different.**

- 9) Can you provide more information on how the costs will breakdown for each option?

**A: The costs presented for each Second Exit/entrance location option include cost estimates for construction and acquiring property. The vast majority of the cost is for construction, including utility relocation, major excavation and underground works. Note that these are Order of Magnitude estimates. A final cost can only be determined once engineering design is completed. The same information was provided at Chester and Donlands for their LWG consultations.**

- 10) As it relates to the Costs category, what is the budget for this project?

**A: TTC has secured program funding for second exits, including at Greenwood. The Second Exit Program budget includes \$97.9 million over the next five years. As an example, \$12.5 million was the Order of Magnitude cost estimation for a second exit/ entrance at Donlands Station and Chester Station’s order of magnitude projection was \$14 million. These are Order of Magnitude figures and are based on the information available on the conceptual layouts.**

**As per all evaluation framework categories, the options will be ranked relative to each other.**

- 11) Is PRESTO covering some of the costs for the second exit/entrance?

**A: No. However, PRESTO fare gates will be installed. When opportunities are available, TTC partners with developers to install second exits/entrances within existing developments or within approved developments such as high-rises to save costs and avoid property impacts. That opportunity is not available at Greenwood Station.**

*Distance Questions:*

- 12) Does the TTC have statistics on the direction that people walk to and from Greenwood Station?

**A: The data has been requested from our Service Planning Department. As soon as any past data is confirmed, it will be provided.**

- 13) Can TTC provide the distances travelled at St. Patrick?

**A: St Patrick Station (distance from platform to outside):**

- Through Northeast Exit Stairs: 66.5m
- Through Northwest Exit Stairs: 66.8m
- Through Southeast Exit Stairs: 112m

- Through Southwest Exit Stairs: 118.5m

St. Patrick Station is a much different context and is not at all comparable to Greenwood Station.

The TTC Board approved second exit/entrance locations for Donlands and Chester Station with underground corridor lengths of 114m and 61m respectively. Those are the most relevant and comparable stations that underwent the same planning process.

Existing conditions can be helpful in providing some context, however the objective of the ranking process is that a *new* second exit/entrance is a separate and new structure which will provide an additional way out of the station in this neighbourhood and the proposed location options will be ranked against each other – not against any existing conditions or other TTC exits. The evaluation framework ranking process provides a fair and consistent approach for the Local Working Group to evaluate potential *new* exit/entrance locations.

*Easier Access Questions:*

- 14) Can ramps, escalators and elevators be added to the pedestrian corridors and to the second exit/entrance building structure to make it accessible?

**A: The Easier Access project for Greenwood Station will include new elevators to make the existing station entrance accessible. All stations must first have elevator access at the main station entrance to ensure there is a direct connection for passengers between the subway and buses.**

Adding escalators to the second exit/entrance building will not bring these to an accessible standard. To make these second exit/entrance buildings accessible, elevators would need to be installed at the platform exits and where level changes are located throughout the pedestrian pathway, thus making the footprint larger and longer (requiring much more space and private property acquisition) and increasing the cost.

Ramps cannot be accommodated as they require extensive lengths to meet requirements, and would also require more space and private property acquisition.

In the event of a fire, mechanically operated equipment like escalators and elevators do not function.

- 15) Where will the elevators be built, and will any Linnsmore homes on the east side of the street be impacted?

**A: Elevators will be built to serve the existing station entrance. Construction will occur in the vicinity of the existing station. Impact to neighbouring properties, if any, has not been determined at this stage. No impacts to the homes on the east side of Linnsmore Crescent are anticipated.**

*Comments:*

Multiple neighbours, business owners, property owners and their representatives participated in the Q&A.

- The business owners of August Kinn expressed the following:
  - Option A (1366 Danforth Avenue) would significantly impact their business during construction (concerns with dust, access, business loss). They cited safety concerns both during and after construction, as multiple strollers, babies and young children require access.
  - Concerns with jaywalking, if Option A were constructed, as schoolchildren would cross midblock near Gillard Avenue.
  - They stated they may benefit from a Danforth location option on the corner of Danforth Avenue and Monarch Park Avenue after construction.
- The property owner of 142 Monarch Park expressed the following:
  - Strong preference for Option C: 1416 Danforth Avenue Money Mart, as it would leave a positive long term legacy for the community.
  - The Region and the City have plans to increase residential development along major avenues like the Danforth, where increased foot traffic would be close to businesses and have a

positive impact on the area. He noted that the neighbourhood is changing and will not look the same in a few years. Option C would be the most appropriate location to plan for the long term as density increases, as noted in the City's recent Plans for Danforth Avenue, east of Coxwell.

- The owner of Red Rocket Coffee expressed concerns with the impact of locating a second exit/entrance at 1366 Danforth (Option A):
  - He asked if there is consideration for local businesses in the Evaluation Framework.  
**A: Yes. LC1 (in Permanent Community Impacts) asks the LWG to rank the options according to their ability to impact on local businesses. Similarly, the Local Community Impact during construction (C3) evaluates impact of the options on local economic activity.**
  - He expressed safety concerns regarding Option A and cited that both his business and parked cars have been hit by vehicles making U-turns in front of Gillard Avenue.
  - He expressed concern with traffic impacts during peak hours near a future second exit/entrance located in the middle of the block on the Danforth.
  - He also noted that the City's growth plan includes more density in residential areas in addition to commercial areas.

**Appendices:**

The presentation from the meeting is posted on the project website:

[http://www.ttc.ca/About the TTC/Projects/Second Exit Projects/Greenwood Station/index.jsp](http://www.ttc.ca/About%20the%20TTC/Projects/Second%20Exit%20Projects/Greenwood%20Station/index.jsp)

Please see: Local Working Group Presentation – March 7, 2018

**Upcoming Meeting:**

- LWG Meeting #7 - Wednesday, March 21, 2018

Time: 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Purpose: Purpose: The LWG members will review and discuss the LWG's preliminary rankings of their location options.

The LWG will submit their final rankings to the TTC after this meeting.