

**Greenwood Station Second Exit
Local Working Group (LWG) Meeting #4
January 31, 2018
St David's Church – Basement 6:30 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.**

Meeting Purpose & Summary:

On January 31, 2018, the TTC hosted the fourth 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 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).

At the January 31, 2018 meeting, TTC presented the functional layout/analysis for each of the ten location options submitted by the Local Working Group (LWG). A TTC presentation was followed by the LWG discussion and questions from the local community.

Approximately 60 neighbours attended. A number of property owners and/or their representative shared their input with the LWG, their neighbours and TTC.

Location Options - Property Impacts Discussion

TTC's functional review of the locations put forward by the Local Working Group, determined that there would be additional private property required to construct some of the options.

OPTION A: 1366 Danforth Avenue

TTC's functional review of **Option A: 1366 Danforth Avenue** determined one additional commercial property acquisition would be required (1370 Danforth Avenue) and that there is the *potential* for property acquisition and/or construction impacts, at Red Rocket Coffee (1364 Danforth Avenue) and 1374 Danforth Avenue locations. **Option A** would require two additional residential property acquisitions at 257 Strathmore Boulevard and 259 Strathmore Boulevard.

A petition objecting to a second exit/entrance building located on Danforth Avenue (between Linnsmore Crescent and Monarch Park Avenue) was submitted by the Danforth Mosaic BIA and owner of Red Rocket Coffee to TTC at the January 31, 2018 meeting. Please see the appendix for a copy of this petition.

The owners of 1370 Danforth Avenue (Back in Motion) requested TTC share their position in favour of a Second Exit Building on the Danforth, including acquisition of their property. Please see the appendix for a copy of this letter.

OPTION I – 261 Strathmore Boulevard

In order to build **Option I (261 Strathmore Boulevard)**, two additional property acquisitions would be required at both 257 Strathmore Boulevard and 259 Strathmore Boulevard.

OPTION J – Strathmore Boulevard at Monarch Park Avenue City Right-of-Way

The TTC presented Option J: Strathmore Boulevard at Monarch Park Avenue City Right-of-Way, depicting a street level building located on the south side of Strathmore Boulevard adjacent to 140 Monarch Park Avenue.

The owner of 140 Monarch Park Avenue requested to see a revision for Option J: to locate the second exit/entrance building in the centre of the City right-of-way/roadway.

TTC explained that the LWG submitted Option J within the City right-of-way for the express purpose and instruction to TTC to avoid acquisition of a home or business. Placing a second exit building directly in the middle of the roadway would cause significant private property impacts due to a required widening of the road, as emergency vehicles need to be able to safely turn around if the street were dead-ended at the west side of Monarch Park Avenue. Thus, placement of a Second Exit/Entrance building was not proposed in the middle of the road, as it would cause the direct opposite impact of what the LWG specifically requested for Option J.

Some LWG members and neighbours asked if TTC can refine Option A and Option I to potentially reduce the number of properties required for acquisition and to refine Option J to locate the second exit building further away from 140 Monarch Park Avenue.

The TTC advised that its technical team had followed the direct instructions for the locations, and agreed that the spirit of the requests was positive and staff would therefore confirm appropriate follow-up with the Expert Panel.

Post Meeting Note:

There was discussion at the January 31 meeting about the TTC project team's flexibility in terms of fine-tuning locations put forward 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 Expert Panel also advised that while the very purpose of the City ROW option (Option J) is to avoid acquisition of any private property, it presents some flexibility that should also be reviewed.

Per the Expert Panel's guidance and upon review by TTC Engineering, there is no opportunity to refine options B, C, D, E, F, G, or H to reduce the number of properties required.

Option "A" (1366 Danforth), Option "I" (261 Strathmore), and Option "J" (City Right-of-Way at Monarch Park and Strathmore) are under review.

The spirit of the process is for TTC's technical team to provide the most beneficial and least impactful functional layouts for the options put forward by the LWG. The work to date and follow-up work that is underway and supported by the Expert Panel is aiming to do that.

Therefore, the TTC project team is investigating these options and will present more information at the February 21, 2018 - LWG Meeting #5.

Next Steps and Updated Schedule:

TTC requested that the LWG and community review the functional layouts that were posted to the project website and provide any questions, concerns or comments to Denise Jayawardene by February 12, 2018.

At the February 21, 2018 LWG#5 meeting, the LWG will continue its review of their location options and discuss the relative merits of each option using the Evaluation Framework categories. TTC will answer questions from the LWG and community.

The LWG will reconvene on March 7th and the LWG will continue its review of their location options and discuss the relative merits of each option using the Evaluation Framework categories. The LWG will submit their preliminary rankings to the TTC after the March 7th meeting.

At the March 21, 2018 meeting, the LWG will review and discuss their preliminary rankings of their location options. They will submit their final rankings individually via email to the TTC after this meeting.

One additional LWG meeting will be required (date TBD) 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 their 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 then 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:

Kathy Katsiroumpas
Oliver Hierlihy
Brian Freeman
Alan Hahn
Grace Bosley
Ian Scott
Alison Motluk
Simon Mortimer

Pam Koch
Daphne Brown
Basil Mangano
Alison Behrend
Bruna Amabile

Regrets:

Duncan Rowe
Lily Chong

Neighbours in attendance

Approximately 60 neighbours attended.

Third Party Expert Panel on Second Exits:

Simon Rees, Jeff Garkowski, Carl Knipfel

TTC Staff:

David Nagler
Kamran Ehsani
Maria Nikolova
Nada Zebouni
Adrian Piccolo
Leandra Nascimento
Denise Jayawardene
Steve Stewart
Lito Romano
Paul Tran
Niki Angelis

City Councillor's Office

Councillor Fragedakis, Daryl Finlayson and Rashid Katsina (Councillor Fragedakis's office)

Agenda:

- Introductions
- Presentation: TTC's review of LWG's 10 location options & LWG discussion
- Q&A with neighbours attending

TTC Post Meeting Action Items:

- TTC to post presentation and meeting notes on the Second Exit project website (completed).
- TTC to request guidance from Expert Panel on flexibility for functional layouts to reduce number of required properties (completed).
- TTC to present information in regards to revised options at the February 21, 2018 meeting.
- TTC to provide order of magnitude costs for all options after obtaining information from City Real Estate.

Meeting Question and Answer Summary:*Functional Analysis Questions:*

- 1) On each of the functional analysis drawings, an approximate construction duration timeline is shown, what do the bars represent?

A: Shortest is approximately 3 years while longest is approximately 5 years. At this preliminary stage it is not possible to project exact timelines. As per all evaluation framework categories, the options will be ranked relative to each other.

- 2) Some of the functional analysis drawings indicate that staircases in the pedestrian corridors are "redundant". What does that mean?

A: The graphic on the bottom left hand corner of each drawings depicts the path that a pedestrian must take in order to travel from the platform to the outside (street level second exit/entrance building). In some cases, staircases must be built over and under existing underground structures (utilities, for example). In those cases, pedestrians must travel down a set of stairs in order to travel back up or vice versa.

- 3) 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?

A: The project team depicted the shortest distance travelled underground for each option. Note that the pedestrian corridor meets the street level structure at different locations, which accounts for the difference in length.

- 4) How many parking spots would be removed in Option J: City R-O-W? Does the road width change?

A: Approximately 10 parking spots would need to be removed. The functional layout for this option maintains one lane of traffic eastbound and one lane of traffic westbound on Strathmore Boulevard.

In order to maintain a lane of traffic in each direction on City property, the lanes and sidewalks just west of Monarch Park Avenue would need to be oriented to the north side of Strathmore Boulevard.

- 5) For all options, will temporary street parking be arranged in front of the new exit/entrance, or will there be "no parking" zones outside the new building?

A: City Transportation will review and make a determination. TTC does not have the authority to do so. TTC will contact the City to request if they can provide an answer for the LWG.

- 6) The functional drawings indicate that some options have an excessive pedestrian corridor length (longer than average lengths are indicated in red text). What does that mean?

A: The graphic on the bottom left hand corner of each drawings depicts the path that a pedestrian must take in order to travel from the platform to the outside (street level second exit/entrance building). The distance from the platform level to the outside is indicated in metres. To provide you with a visual example, the length of a standard platform is 150m. The wording was provided to give context to the distance. It is not a regulatory number.

Easier Access Questions:

- 7) 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 main 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 would not bring the second exit/entrance building to an accessible standard. Elevators would need to be installed where redundant level changes are located throughout the pedestrian pathway, thus making the corridor larger and longer (requiring more space/property acquisition) and cost.

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

Construction Questions:

- 8) The functional analyses show that some properties will be impacted by acquisitions and or easements. Please explain what "Property Impacts" are:

A: Right-of-Way (ROW) is the city-owned portion land, typically from the street to front yards. The ROW allows the city to build and maintain the street, curb and gutter, storm sewers and underground utilities. A right-of-way may include curbs, sidewalks and utilities and portions of side or front yards. Since the depth of a ROW varies from location to location, a survey needs to be conducted, and property records will be reviewed again to determine the exact dimension of any given right-of-way.

The City of Toronto is responsible for acquiring any private property that may be required to construct a TTC project.

Property acquisition may include a full or partial purchase of property (which may mean only a portion of a property, including below ground.)

A "temporary easement" may be required during construction only. In all cases where private property is required, property owners are compensated by the City of Toronto.

- 9) For those options where the pedestrian corridor runs through/under residential backyards, is tunnelling an option?

A: Tunnel boring for this project is not feasible; it would require purchase of tunnel boring machines and the provision of a launch shaft and an extraction shaft on either side of the future second exit/entrance underground corridor connection. This would add enormous cost and significant local construction impacts to the neighbourhood.

"Open cut excavation" is commonly used for this type of construction to minimize construction impacts and costs.

10) Was the existing gas main under Linnsmore Crescent taken into consideration for the functional analysis:

A: Yes. Known underground utilities were taken into consideration during the functional analysis. During construction, some utilities will need to be relocated and/or new underground facilities will need to be built around the utilities to maintain and suspend them.

11) How will residents access their homes during construction?

A: For some options, a shared porch may need to be built to provide access to homes where the front yard space is minimal during a portion of the excavation period of construction. Below is an example of temporary shared front porch access that was constructed to maintain access during Woodbine Station construction. At the conclusion of construction, the porches were of course rebuilt in consultation with the homeowners.



12) How will the construction be phased?

A: Construction will be staged in phases for any location selected. The project will require any contractor to obtain multiple permits from the City of Toronto. As with other road works, the adjacent roadway will be occupied with hoarding and construction materials which will shift through different phases of the project. It is not possible to confirm exact staging at this functional layout stage.

Design Questions:

13) Can the TTC preserve any of the existing buildings (like the Money Mart building at 1414 Danforth) as part of the design for the future second exit?

A: The functional layouts for each option assume removal of the *building structures*.

Post meeting note:

No determination has been made at this stage regarding the potential preservation of the *façade* should 1414-1416 Danforth Avenue be put forward (or for any location option)

The LWG will be ranking all locations on their relative merits for Local Community Impact (permanent impact of the building). Specifically, “LC6 – Streetscape” includes the following sub criteria:

- **Whether the location will easily allow for a surface exit design that compliments the existing community context;**

- Whether the location provides the opportunity for a surface exit design that may serve as an architectural centerpiece for the local community;
- Whether the location provides the opportunity to improve awareness of local heritage landmarks and public art;
- The possibility to integrate with existing and possible new buildings.

No extensive structural investigations are completed for any of the locations at this stage, the functional layouts for every location assumed a new building structure.

As part of the Planning Process the TTC will hold consultation on the architecture, urban design and landscape design of the second exit.

14) Why is the Greenwood Station second exit being planned before Coxwell Station?

Post meeting note:

A: Ridership is not the determining factor of prioritizing second exits. As an example, Chester Station will undergo construction before Donlands, Greenwood, College and Dundas.

Coxwell has two means of egress from platform to concourse spaced at least 25m apart from each platform. The routes converge at the concourse.

Unlike Greenwood, at Coxwell there is an escalator which is separated from the staircase by more than 25m on each platform. Greenwood Station's staircase and escalator are side by side at the same opening.

This makes Greenwood a higher priority station with only one means of egress from the platform to concourse.

15) Can the TTC construct an underground pedestrian walkway between Greenwood and Coxwell Stations (instead of building a second exit in the Greenwood neighbourhood)?

Post meeting note:

A: This would entail open cut construction along Strathmore Boulevard for all homes between Greenwood and Coxwell Station.

While providing access between stations, this would not provide a direct way out between the subway platform and street level access in the event of an emergency, such as a fire.

16) Is it possible to build only an exit (and not an entrance) and to fit it onto a smaller lot that only requires one detached home versus two homes (semi-detached)? Can only an emergency exit building structure be built instead (which would require less street level space)?

A: TTC's policy is for all "second exits" to function as daily entrances to provide customer familiarity and convenience. As TTC farelines are being replaced by bi-directional PRESTO fare gates, retrofits are underway to convert existing "exit-only" facilities to daily entrances, such as at Pape Station.

Building a daily use exit-only building would only be marginally smaller than a second exit/entrance building. Building an "emergency exit building" would be smaller but this would not achieve the goal of providing improved customer convenience and familiarity (which is key in the event of an emergency). The same level of construction would be required.

Evaluation Matrix Questions:

17) Will the evaluation rankings be made public?

A: Yes, preliminary rankings will be discussed at the March 21, 2018 meeting. The anonymous final rankings for each LWG member will also be made public at the final meeting (date TBD).

Comments:

Multiple property owners, property owner representatives and neighbours submitted comments.

- The property owners of 7 Linnsmore Crescent expressed concerns and objections regarding the use of their property as a potential second exit.
- The new property owner of 140 Monarch Park noted his objection to Option J: the City right of way, as the proposed street level building is directly adjacent to his home.
- A request to close down Greenwood Station was made.
- A resident on Monarch Park Avenue expressed concerns about the Local Working Group. He advised that he is concerned that there is over-representation on the LWG from Strathmore residents, and indicated that more than one Strathmore Boulevard midblock option should have been put forward by the Local Working Group to the TTC for evaluation.

Post meeting note:

TTC has received communication from residents on Monarch Park Avenue, Linnsmore Avenue, Strathmore Boulevard and businesses on The Danforth clearly stating opposition to their property and/or adjacent properties or City owned property being used for the purpose of a Second Exit/Entrance Building. The LWG as a whole (including residents who happen to live on Strathmore Boulevard) put forward a midblock Strathmore location for evaluation.

Prior to the September 12, 2017 LWG meeting, a letter signed by a number of Monarch Park Avenue neighbours was sent to the TTC outlining their concerns with the LWG applicant selection process and the LWG's location submissions.

TTC provided a written response indicating:

- **"TTC staff does not and cannot select the volunteer members of the Local Working Group. The third party Expert Panel reviewed the request to reconsider the composition of the LWG, and specifically to appoint/include more residents from Monarch Park Avenue. The Expert Panel indicated that it would be unfair to those who applied to the open call for applications in April and May, 2017 to re-start a new application process. Advanced notification was provided to the community, including to all residents on Monarch Park Avenue. This included an application form which was mailed to approximately 750 local residents via Canada Post in advance of the deadline (with a one month time period to apply)."**
- **"Multiple LWG representatives have advised that they will support putting forward a midblock Strathmore Boulevard location option (and more generally options from a variety of locations) on September 12 for technical analysis by the TTC."**

After receiving the letter from neighbours on Monarch Park Avenue, TTC and the Expert Panel agreed to extend the deadline for submission of location options in order to allow Monarch Park Avenue residents (and the whole community) to submit additional locations to the LWG for consideration. No additional locations (on Strathmore Boulevard or elsewhere) were submitted to the TTC for the LWG's consideration.

Subsequently, on September 12, 2017, the LWG voted as a group to put forward a mid-block option on Strathmore Boulevard (Option I: 261 Strathmore Boulevard) and nine other locations.

The TTC will continue to ensure the concerns of Monarch Avenue neighbours (and all neighbours) are shared with the Local Working Group and Expert Panel.

Post meeting questions received:

18) What will happen to existing vegetation including mature trees during construction?

A: No detailed investigations have been conducted by a professional arborist at this early stage for any option.

The LWG will be ranking all locations on their relative merits for Local Community Impact. Specifically, “LC9 – Vegetation” includes these sub criteria:

- Mitigation of damage to vegetation during construction;
- Retention of vegetation of exceptional quality such as mature trees;
- Replanting opportunities near surface exit location.

Some trees and bushes would need to be removed during construction depending on the location, and some properties affected will have some limitations to landscaping directly above the underground structure. Existing landscaping will be replaced in kind wherever possible after construction. The exact details of any impact can't be confirmed at this stage. Criteria LC9, includes review of impacts to existing vegetation/trees.

Evaluation Framework Process Questions:

19) What is the Expert Panel's role and what is their framework based on?

A: As part of its commitment to modernization, TTC developed a new process designed by a third party Expert Panel of professional planners, architects and construction experts, to involve local communities in determining second exit locations. The process includes establishing a local working group that is selected by the Expert Panel. The Local Working Group's role is to submit and assess potential locations using an evaluation framework.

The framework is based on five equally weighted criteria, and was approved by the TTC Board:

Safety

Local community impact – Second Exit (permanent)

Local community impact – Construction Period

Customer experience

Cost

20) Option J: City ROW is shown on the map in the centre of the roadway. Why was the street level building placed on the south side of Strathmore Boulevard at Monarch Park Avenue?

A: Please note that the map of the top ten locations selected for review states on the left hand side, that all symbols do not represent their exact location. Similarly, please note that the symbols/dots for Option A, Option I and Option C show that they are located on the sidewalk or on a front lawn- which is of course not the intended location put forward by the LWG for review. That is why every location was spelled out in text. At no time was there a design requirement submitted by the LWG “to dead end the street”. The LWG's specific instructions to TTC were to avoid acquisition of any private property for Option J.

21) How does the TTC compensate residents affected by construction activities?

A: The City of Toronto compensates owners whose properties (or parts of property such as a section of a yard) are required either temporarily or permanently to construct new infrastructure. This is done through agreements by the City of Toronto. The City does not provide compensation through tax breaks or operating subsidies to residents or businesses adjacent to long term infrastructure improvement projects.

22) How does TTC assess if damage is caused to properties close to construction sites?

A: Property owners adjacent to construction are offered vibration monitors during construction to monitor and obtain measurements throughout construction, and ensure appropriate mitigation is implemented if readings approach regulated levels. Safety is the top priority of any TTC construction project.

As part of the standard process, properties close to construction will be contacted well beforehand and be offered a condition survey. With the home or business owner's approval, such surveys/inspections are carried out by a third party before (and after) the completion of construction to document the condition of your property. It is in the TTC and builder's strong interest to plan ahead to avoid any potential property impact to our neighbours through proactive measures. In the rare event of any damage, the survey/inspection reports help to identify any changes that may have resulted from construction. The contractor is responsible to repair any damage attributed to its work.

23) How do the costs breakdown?

A: The costs presented for each Second Exit/entrance location option will include cost estimates for acquiring property and construction itself. Note that these are Order of Magnitude estimates.

24) Can the TTC provide a legend for all of the symbols on the map?

A: The drawings depict some of TTC's required customer service equipment such as PRESTO fare gates, screens, fare vending machines and staircases. These are not detailed drawings and symbols were placed to provide an example of the type of customer service equipment in a standard TTC station pay fare area. Locations/number of symbols do not represent exact their locations.

25) Will 1364 Danforth Avenue/Red Rocket Coffee be required as a second exit location?

A: No location has been determined and the LWG did not put forward Red Rocket Coffee/1364 Danforth Avenue as one of their ten suggested locations. The volunteers could not have known that Red Rocket Coffee would be potentially impacted until TTC completed its recent engineering review for Option A – 1366 Danforth Avenue.

TTC's functional review of "Option A": 1366 Danforth Avenue, determined one additional property acquisition would be required (1370 Danforth Avenue) and there is the *potential* for property acquisition and/or construction impacts, however, further investigation is required to determine the actual impacts for both the Red Rocket Coffee (1364 Danforth Avenue) and 1374 Danforth Avenue locations. Option A would also require two additional property acquisitions at 257 and 259 Strathmore Boulevard.

26) Do the Danforth Options show an alleyway/space in between the new second exit/entrance building and the neighbouring buildings? How will this space look once construction is complete?

A: No, they do not show alleyways. The functional layouts depict the amount of space required to place the building. Remaining space between the buildings is not intended to depict an alleyway. The exact use of any “extra” space would be determined during detailed design - with a priority on safety.

27) How will pedestrian and wheelchair access be maintained during construction?

A: Details such as hoarding and exact construction impacts cannot be determined at this stage. Access to residential homes will be maintained as required. Here are some examples of how TTC’s contractor has provided access to homes near construction sites on comparable projects:

- Temporary porches with stairs or ramps can be installed during construction.
- Rear or alternative accesses can be used.
- Temporary walkways can be built during construction.
- Customized arrangements with residents who have disabilities.
- Re-routing of access to accommodate persons with mobility challenges.

28) My home is listed under “properties and right of way impacts”. How would my front Lawn be impacted during construction, and *after the finished product is built*?

A: The term “properties and right of way impacts” has been used to identify a potential impact. After the finished product is built, some locations will have an underground structure beneath their property. In that case, homeowners are compensated by the City of Toronto through a permanent easement agreement.

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** – January 31, 2018
- **Upcoming Meetings:**
LWG Meeting #5 - Wednesday, February 21, 2018
Time: 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.
Purpose: The LWG will continue its review of their location options and discuss the relative merits of each option using the Evaluation Framework categories. TTC will answer questions from the LWG and community.

- **The owners of 1368/1370 Danforth Avenue requested that their letter of support for a second exit on the Danforth be shared on February 7, 2018:**

I would like to take the time to address the board regarding the proposed sites for the TTC exit at Greenwood station. My husband and I own 1368-1370 Danforth Ave. We have had our Business (Back In Motion) for 11 years and we have owned the building for 8.

This isn't just a building where we had our business, we also lived upstairs for 9 years. We were newlyweds in our building and we brought home our three babies there as well. This building has a great sentimental value to us because it was our stability in our first years as a family. We have grown to love our neighbourhood and those in it. They are not just our patients or neighbours, but they are our family.

It was surprising to receive a letter from the TTC informing us that our building was a proposed site for the exit. My husband and I had mixed emotions because we did not know what it all entailed etc.

Right away we began to ask questions and research what the options were for the neighbourhood. What we came to understand was there were a lot of residential options for the exit. Also, the exit was designed to allow a safe and timely exit in case of any emergency.

That got us thinking what it all meant. On the one hand, we would have to relocate our business and give up a space which means so much to us. Also, would there be fair compensation for building, business, and tenants? On the other hand, we felt we were being selfish, because upon further examination we realized that the safety of the many outweighed the needs of the few. Also, in order to have a residential exit the TTC would have to alter the flow of the neighbourhood. We believed it would be easier for businesses to move instead of having to move people out of their homes.

After careful consideration, my husband and I came to this conclusion. We are 100% on board for the TTC to purchase our building and create the exit on Danforth Ave. We feel it's the most logical location because it is directly in line with the end of the Greenwood platform. We believe that it would be the least disruptive to the neighbourhood and residential roads. We believe that the foot traffic such a station would create should be on a busy road with sidewalks designed for that foot traffic and not a quiet residential street.

- The Danny BIA requested that their petition against a second exit on the Danforth between Linnsmore and Monarch Park Avenue be shared:



Letter of Objection
Greenwood Station Second Exit Locations on Danforth Ave

The here undersigned business & commercial property owners located on Danforth Ave between Linnsmore Cr and Monarch Park Ave would like to state their concern and objection to the Greenwood Station Second Exit being located on Danforth Ave based on the following criteria:

- 1) Construction impacts would limit the successful daily operations of the businesses, causing financial loss and hardship to the local business owners.
- 2) Increased safety concerns on Danforth Ave due to irregular & illegal stopping for passenger drop-off & pickup, along with increased j-walking on a major & busy thoroughfare.
- 3) Dubious commercial tenant compensation strategies for the tenants of expropriated properties, potentially leading to significant financial loss.

| Name | Business Address | Signature |
|-----------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Michelle Corpuz | 1402 Danforth Ave | |
| Joe Scavarella | 1398 Danforth Ave | |
| Julie Watt | 1374 Danforth Ave. | |
| Katri Smith | 1374 Danforth Ave. | |
| KARIM SAMI | 1366 DANFORTH | |
| Sarah McDonald | 1360 Danforth Ave | |
| DANIA RUCIUKO | 1344 DANFORTH AVE | |
| JrE Song | 1340 DANFORTH | JUSTINE SONG |

| Name | Business Address | Signature |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Hema Mirdock | 1312 Danforth Ave | |
| Jay Feng | 1308 Danforth Ave | |
| Sophie Angers | 1 Linnsmore cres | |
| Grace Chen | 5 Linnsmore | |
| Meseret Molla | 5A Linnsmore | |
| Leslie Padon | 1390 Danforth | Leslie Padon |
| Pr ^{B. BENTLEY} | 1364 DANFORTH AVE | |
| Michelle Beliste | 1376 Danforth Ave | Michelle Beliste |
| BANCHI | 1408 DANFORTH | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |