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REPORT DISCLAIMER

NOTWITHSTANDING the results and recommendations presented in this study, Archaeological Services Inc. notes that no cultural heritage assessment, no matter how thorough or carefully completed, can necessarily identify every property and/or structure that has not been previously identified as a known or potential cultural heritage resource. Cultural heritage assessments for transportation related projects are limited to the public right-of-way, and as such, potential cultural heritage resources on private property may be screened from view by vegetation and/or other barriers. In the event that a potential cultural heritage resource is found during subsequent construction activities, the consultant cultural heritage specialist and approval authority should be immediately notified.
Executive Summary

ASI was contracted by Morrison Hershfield on behalf of Metrolinx to conduct a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Recommendations Report (CHERR) of the Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge, Mile 31.28 (Lakeshore West rail corridor) as part of the GO Rail Network Electrification Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP). Metrolinx is undertaking a Transit Project Assessment study under Ontario Regulation 231/08 - Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings for electrification of the GO Rail Network. The purpose of the Project is to convert the GO Network from diesel to electric power. The Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge was identified as a Conditional Heritage Property as part of the Cultural Heritage Screening Report completed for this Project. The Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge is located at Mile 31.28 of the Lakeshore West rail corridor, and is owned by the City of Burlington. The overhead bridge carries pedestrian traffic over the rail corridor.

Part 1 of this CHER provides a description of the potential cultural heritage resource, including a summary of the bridges historical and current context (Section 1), a description of methodology and sources (Section 2), existing heritage recognition of the resource (Section 3), a description of adjacent lands (Section 4), summary of previous archaeological assessments (Section 5), community input (Section 6), and discussion of cultural heritage value (Section 7). A data sheet for the Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge is provided in Section 8 and figures, including mapping and photographs, are provided in Section 9. Part 2 of this CHER contains the Recommendations Report which presents the evaluation tables outlining criteria set out in Ontario Regulations 9/06 and 10/06 and recommended outcome of the evaluation.

The CHER was conducted by Joel Konrad, Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, and John Sleath, Cultural Heritage Assistant, ASI.
1 Introduction

ASI was contracted by Morrison Hershfield on behalf of Metrolinx to conduct a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Recommendations Report (CHERR) of the Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge, Mile 31.28 (Lakeshore West rail corridor) as part of the GO Rail Network Electrification Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP). Metrolinx is undertaking a Transit Project Assessment study under Ontario Regulation 231/08 - Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings for electrification of the GO Rail Network. The purpose of the Project is to convert the GO Network from diesel to electric power. The Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge was identified as a Conditional Heritage Property as part of the Cultural Heritage Screening Report completed for this Project.

1.1 Description of Property

The Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge is located at Mile 31.28 of the GO Transit Lakeshore West rail corridor, and is located in the City of Burlington (Figure1-2 and Figure 1-2). The bridge is a single-span, steel beam structure that carries pedestrian traffic in a northwest and southeast direction over three rail lines. The bridge is located within one ownership parcel: PIN 07077-011. The bridge is currently owned and maintained by the City of Burlington.

1.2 Historical Summary

The Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge is located in part of Lot 17, Concession III (South of Dundas Street) in the historic Township of Nelson in the former County of Halton. The bridge is located northeast of the historic hamlets of Wellington Square and Port Nelson, which amalgamated in 1873 to form the Village of Burlington (See historical mapping in Section 9.0).

The Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge was built in 1972 and was later widened in 1984. The bridge underwent rehabilitation work in 1992 and again in 1998, and was briefly closed to the public in 2011 with the intention to demolish. Due to public outcry, the bridge was instead repaired and reopened in 2012.

1.3 Current Context

The Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge is located on a small east-west roadway in the City of Burlington. The area around the bridge is a residential neighbourhood to the north, and commercial/ warehousing to the south. The residential areas primarily consist of single, detached family homes while the southern commercial area features several automotive mechanic repair shops and warehouses.

The properties adjacent to the bridge include: single detached family homes to the northeast and northwest; and, two one-storey automotive repair shops on the southeast and southwest. All of these adjacent features appear to have been constructed more than 40 years ago.
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Figure 1-1: Location of the Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge study area in the City of Burlington, Ontario (Open Street Map)

Figure 1-2: West elevation of the Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge
2 Methodology and Sources

2.1 Legislation and Policy Context

This cultural heritage screening considers cultural heritage resources in the context of improvements to specified areas, pursuant to Ontario Regulation 231/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (Transit Projects Regulation) and the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act (EAA 1990). Pursuant to the Environmental Assessment Act, applicable infrastructure projects are subject to assessment so as to determine related impacts on above ground cultural heritage resources (MTO 2006). Infrastructure projects have the potential to impact cultural heritage resources in a variety of ways such as loss or displacement of resources through removal or demolition and the disruption of resources by introducing physical, visual, audible or atmospheric elements that are not in keeping with the resources and/or their setting.

When considering cultural heritage resources in the context of improvements to specified areas, a 40 year old threshold is used as a guiding principle when identifying cultural heritage resources. While identification of a resource that is 40 years old or older does not confer outright heritage significance, this threshold provides a means to collect information about resources that may retain heritage value. Similarly, if a resource is slightly younger than 40 years old, this does not preclude the resource from retaining heritage value.

The TPAP is defined in sections 6-17 in Ontario Regulation 213/08: Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings, and provides a series of relevant provisions and definitions. The TPAP Guide (January 2014) includes provisions to consider when the proposed project may have a negative impact on a matter of provincial importance, which is defined as follows (2014: 2):

“...a matter of provincial importance that relates to the natural environment or has cultural heritage value or interest...”

The TPAP Guide further notes that identification and assessment of potentially impacted built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes, and protected heritage properties are relevant in determining if a matter is of ‘provincial importance’ (2014: 10). It should be noted that the TPAP Guide acknowledges that a built heritage resource, cultural heritage landscape, or protected heritage property does not necessarily need to meet criteria set out under Regulation 10/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act to be considered of ‘provincial importance’.

The analysis used throughout the cultural heritage resource assessment process addresses cultural heritage resources under other various pieces of legislation and their supporting guidelines:
• **Environmental Assessment Act** (R.S.O. 1990, Chapter E.18)
  - Guideline for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (MCC – MOE 1992)

• **Ontario Heritage Act** (R.S.O. 1990, Chapter O.18) and a number of guidelines and reference documents prepared by the Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC):
  - Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (MTC 2010)
  - Ontario Heritage Tool Kit (MCL 2006)

• **Planning Act** (R.S.O. 1990, Chapter P.13) and the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement

This assessment was also guided by the Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process (Metrolinx 2013b), and the Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (Metrolinx 2014).

### 2.2 Approach to Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report


- A general description of the history of the study area as well as a detailed historical summary of property ownership and building(s) development;
- A description of the cultural heritage landscape and built heritage resources;
- Representative photographs of the exterior and interior of a building or structure, and character-defining architectural details;
- A cultural heritage resource evaluation guided by the *Ontario Heritage Act* criteria;
- A summary of heritage attributes;
- Historical mapping, photographs; and
- A location plan.
A site visit was conducted by Joel Konrad, Cultural Heritage Specialist, on June 15, 2016, to conduct photographic documentation of the subject resources. The assessment was conducted from publicly-accessible areas.

2.2.1 List of Key Sources and Research Limitations

Key Sources

Background historical research, which includes the consultation of primary and secondary source documents, photos, and historic mapping, was undertaken to identify early settlement patterns and broad agents or themes of change in a study area. In addition, on-site archival research was undertaken at the following libraries and archives to build upon information gleaned from other primary and secondary materials:

- City of Burlington Central Public Library; and
- Archives of Ontario.

Where available, comprehensive bridge inventories were consulted for comparative analysis purposes to determine the potential design value of the subject bridge. The Metrolinx Master Bridge List (2015) recording information such as bridge name, location, construction date, material, bridge type, number of spans and overall bridge length, was provided by Metrolinx and utilized for comparative purposes. Additional sources were considered for comparative analysis where relevant.

Available federal, provincial and municipal heritage inventories and databases were also consulted to obtain information about the property. These included:

- The City of Burlington’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources;
- The Ontario Heritage Trust’s Provincial Plaque Program database;
- Park’s Canada’s Directory of Federal Heritage Designations, a searchable on-line database that identifies National Historic Sites, National Historic Events, National Historic People, Heritage Railway Stations, Federal Heritage Buildings, and Heritage Lighthouses; and
- Park’s Canada’s Historic Places website: a searchable on-line register that provides information on historic places recognized for their heritage value at the local, provincial, territorial and national levels.

Previous consultant reports associated with potential above-ground cultural heritage resources and archaeological resources within and/or adjacent to the GO Network Electrification EA included the following:

- Cultural Heritage Screening Report: GO Rail Network Electrification TPAP (ASI 2016)
A full list of references consulted can be found in Section 20 of this CHER.

Research Limitations
No research limitations were identified.

2.3 Consultation
Heritage Burlington was contacted by email to inquire about the heritage status of the resource as part of the Cultural Heritage Screening Report. Banani Afsana at the City of Burlington was contacted in November 2015. The Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge is not currently identified as a cultural heritage resource.

3 Heritage Recognitions

3.1 Municipal
The subject resource is not currently listed as a heritage property by the City of Burlington, and is not designated under Part IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act.

3.2 Provincial
The subject resource does not retain heritage recognition at the provincial level for the following reasons:

- The Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge, which is owned by the City of Burlington, is not a Provincial Heritage Property; and
- The subject property has not been commemorated by the Ontario Heritage Trust.

3.3 Federal
The subject resource does not retain heritage recognition at the federal level for the following reasons:

- The subject property does not contain a Federal Heritage Building; and
- The subject property is not a National Historic Site.

4 Adjacent Lands
The Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge is not adjacent to any protected properties.
5 Summary of Archaeological Assessments
The Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment for the GO Rail Network Electrification TPAP is currently underway (ASI, in progress). Once completed, this report will provide information about archaeological potential in the study area.

6 Community Input
Heritage Burlington, the Burlington Historical Society, and the City of Burlington, Capital Works were contacted to collect any information relating to the Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge, including a request for the original bridge drawings, (Table 6-1). A response was still outstanding at the time of writing.

See Table 6-1 for a list of organizations contacted and a description of information received.

A review of various online sources did not reveal any interest from the community in the potential heritage value of the Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Date(s) of Communications</th>
<th>Description of Information Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banani Afsana</td>
<td>Heritage Burlington</td>
<td><a href="mailto:banani.afsana@burlington.ca">banani.afsana@burlington.ca</a></td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>No information received at the time of report writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Burlington Historical Society</td>
<td>P.O. Box 93164, 1450 Headon Rd.</td>
<td>3 June 2016</td>
<td>No information received at the time of report writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Clark</td>
<td>City of Burlington Capital Works</td>
<td>426 Brant Street, Burlington, ON, L7R 3Z6</td>
<td>15 June 2016</td>
<td>No information received at the time of report writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Discussion of Cultural Heritage Value

7.1 Discussion of Historical or Associative Value

7.1.1 Settlement History

* Nelson Township
The land within Nelson Township was acquired by the British from the Mississaugas in 1795. The first township survey was undertaken in 1806, and the first legal settlers occupied their land holdings in the same year. The township was first named “Alexander Township” in honour of Alexander Grant, the administrator of Upper Canada. In 1806, it was renamed in honour of Horatio Viscount Nelson, after his
victory at Cabo Trafalgar in Spain the previous year. Nelson was initially settled by the children of Loyalists, soldiers who served during the War of 1812, and by immigrants from England, Scotland and Ireland. By the 1840s, the township was noted for its good land and excellent farms (Smith 1846:121; Armstrong 1985:143; Rayburn 1997:237).

The 1858 Tremaine’s Map (Figure 9-1) depicts the study area as a rural, agricultural area in the mid nineteenth century. The towns of Wellington Square and Port Nelson are located to the south of the study area, on the north shore of Lake Ontario. A roadway (modern day Queensway Drive) is located to the north of the study area. The study area is depicted as an agricultural lot owned by Asahel Gage, however, no farmstead or any other features are depicted in the vicinity.

The 1878 Illustrated Historical Atlas (Figure 9-2) depicts the study area as retaining a rural agricultural context into the late nineteenth century, with one farmstead and orchard depicted to the north of the study area. The lot on which the study area is located is owned by the Heirs of Thomas Baxter, and is located directly north of the Town of Burlington limits.

The 1923 topographical map (Figure 9-3) continues to depict the study area in the same rural context as the nineteenth century mapping. One house is depicted to the south of the study area, which is accessed by a small municipal road that connects to Guelph Line to the east. The Town of Burlington, located to the south, is shown to have experienced continued growth and development into the early twentieth century.

The 1954 Aerial Photograph of Southern Ontario (Figure 9-4) demonstrates that the study area vicinity underwent considerable development in the mid twentieth century. The area to the north of the rail line depicts a residential community stretching from the rail line northwards to the Queen Elizabeth Way, with the extant houses to the northeast and northwest of the current rail bridge visible. The area south of the rail line retains several farmlands, with the addition of some manufacturing/warehouse facilities. Drury Lane, Fairview Street, and the Queen Elizabeth Way are depicted in their present alignment. In general, the study area vicinity is shown to have developed into a suburban area, with some agriculture still present.

The 1999 NTS map (Figure 9-5) depicts the study area as part of the urban boundaries of the City of Burlington by the end of the twentieth century. The residential area north of the rail line, labeled Glenwood Park, is shaded entirely in pink, indicating higher density development. The area south of the rail line is depicted as a manufacturing/warehousing area, with many large buildings evident in the general area. South of Fairview Street is depicted as a residential community. While the pedestrian bridge had been constructed by this date, no bridge is evident in the mapping.
7.1.2 Significant Themes, Events and/or People

Railway Development

The Lakeshore West rail corridor follows the tracks initially laid in 1855 from Toronto to Hamilton by the Hamilton & Toronto Railway Company (HTR). The HTR company was established by Sir Allan MacNab and a number of other investors, with additional financial support from England, and a charter was granted in 1852. Construction on the line began in 1853. The line was initially leased to the GWR, who in turn supplied railway stations along the corridor (Paterson & George 1988:13). Extending from downtown Toronto, the rail line passed through Mimico, Port Credit, Clarkson, Oakville, Bronte, Burlington, and finally Hamilton. In 1871, the HTR amalgamated with the GWR, and in 1882 the GWR amalgamated with the GTR. In 1920, control of the GTR was assumed by the Canadian Government and three years later, in 1923, the GTR was amalgamated with Canadian National Railways (CNR) (Andreae 1997).

The Lakeshore West Corridor was built along the Lake Ontario shoreline, on level terrain formerly located at the bottom of glacial Lake Iroquois. While the route presented few engineering obstacles, two of note include the two wooden trestles built to span the Twelve and Sixteen Mile Creek Valleys. Each valley is over 150 m wide and 38 m deep. Also significant is the Credit River and associated flood plains. While just as wide, the Credit River Valley is not as high and as such, extensive filling and low trestle work led to a smaller bridge (Paterson and George 1988:14). The wooden trestle bridges were replaced by the GWR with stone and iron structures around the 1880s.

Between 1910 and 1920, the GTR undertook a grade separation project that lowered the railway tracks and required the construction of overhead structures for all north-south roads in the Parkdale area, including Dufferin Street, Dunn Avenue, Jameson Avenue, and Dowling Avenue. In total, the project eliminated thirteen level crossings (McLeod & McNeil 1979).

The Lakeshore West Corridor was Canada’s busiest railway corridor during the nineteenth and most of the twentieth century (Paterson & George 1988: 15, 24). Another notable pedestrian bridge on the Lakeshore West Corridor includes the Sunnyside Bridge in the City of Toronto.

Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge

The subject bridge was built in 1972 in response to heavy pedestrian traffic across the railway in the vicinity of Drury Lane. Public pressure precipitated the Burlington City Council to approve $45,000 for the creation of a pedestrian bridge over the railway connecting the two truncated halves of Drury Lane. The project was approved by the federal Railway Transport Committee in December, 1971 and construction began the following year. The bridge designer and construction firm responsible for erection are unknown.

Structural modifications for widening were undertaken in 1984, minor structural repairs were completed in 1992, and the wooden deck was replaced with steel-plate decking in 1998 (Figure 9-6 to
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Figure 9-10). A scheduled structural inspection in 2011 concluded that the structure was unsafe to carry its design load, resulting in the closure of the bridge. The temporary loss of the bridge highlighted the importance of pedestrian traffic across the railway in that location, with many residents of the Glenwood Park community registered their complaints at the loss. In addition to transportation, the bridge serves a community function as a viewing platform for railway enthusiasts to watch passing trains.

7.2 Discussion of Design and Physical Value

7.2.1 Physical Characteristics
The subject bridge is a single span, through truss bridge comprised of steel members. The members are bolted together and painted green. A metal railing stretches the length of the deck on both sides of the bridge and chain-link fencing surrounding the deck ensures pedestrians cannot access the tracks. Metal decking is affixed to a wood platform resting on metal crossbeams below the bridge. Ramps at either end provide access to the deck and consist of five, graded platforms carrying pedestrian traffic to the bridge deck (Figure 9-11 to Figure 9-19).

The bridge was built in 1972 and has undergone several repairs during the intervening decades, including structural widening in 1984, structural repairs in 1992, replacement of original wood decking in 1998, and major structural repairs in 2012. It is not known to have won any awards or received special recognition.

7.2.2 Comparative Analysis
The Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge is a one-span, steel through truss bridge with a deck length of 40.2 metres.

According to the Metrolinx bridge inventory, the subject bridge is the fourth longest pedestrian bridge spanning a Metrolinx Rail right-of-way, with the longest being the Sunnyside Pedestrian Bridge measuring 175 metres. The Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge is also the sixth oldest pedestrian bridge and the third oldest pedestrian truss bridge, the oldest being the Wallace Avenue Pedestrian Bridge through-truss bridge built in 1907.

7.3 Discussion of Contextual Value

7.3.1 Description of Setting and Character of the Property and Surroundings
The subject bridge connects the Glenwood Park community in the north with the commercial properties lining Fairview Street. The former consists of single-family homes generally built in the mid-twentieth century lining Drury Lane, oriented northwest-southeast. The latter consists of parking lots, commercial and light-industrial buildings lining Drury Lane southeast to Fairview Street. The subject bridge is visible
from the surrounding environs due to its prominence above the rail corridor, and much of the local area is visible from the bridge. The subject bridge spans the rail corridor, which consists of three tracks at this location, and is located less than half a kilometer from the Burlington GO Station.

7.3.2 Community Landmark
The Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge is an important crossing for the residents of the Glenwood Park community, connecting them to the schools and shopping on the south of the rail tracks. The bridge was closed in 2011 after a structural inspection of the bridge identified corrosion and deterioration, eliciting a forceful response from the community of Glenwood Park. Due to the community support for the refurbishing instead of demolishing the bridge, the City of Burlington was persuaded to repair the structure at a cost of $380,000. The bridge was reopened in 2012 with an anticipated service life of five years. While not considered a landmark, a pedestrian crossing in this location has been identified by residents as an important pedestrian transportation route.
8 Data Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Name:</th>
<th>Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge (Mile 31.28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Address:</td>
<td>43.3436742, -79.80512282, Datum WGS84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality:</td>
<td>City of Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrolinx/GO Transit Rail Corridor:</td>
<td>Lakeshore West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN:</td>
<td>07077-0111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership:</td>
<td>City of Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Construction:</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect/Designer/Builder:</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Owner(s)/Occupant(s):</td>
<td>City of Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Function:</td>
<td>Pedestrian Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Function(s):</td>
<td>Pedestrian Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Recognition/Protection:</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Heritage Interest:</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Lands:</td>
<td>No protected heritage properties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9 Figures

9.1 Historic Map Review

Figure 9-1: View of the study area on 1858 historic mapping (Tremaine 1858)

Figure 9-2: View of the study area on 1878 historic mapping (Walker & Miles 1878)
Figure 9-3: View of the study area on 1923 topographic mapping (Department of National Defence 1923)

Figure 9-4: View of the study area on 1954 aerial photography (Hunting Survey Corporation 1954)
Figure 9-5: View of the study area on 1999 topographic mapping (Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1999)
9.2 Select Structural Drawings

Figure 9-6: Select structural drawings showing the anticipated bridge repairs in 2012 (AMEC 2012)
Figure 9-7: Select structural drawings showing the anticipated bridge repairs in 2012 (AMEC 2012)
Figure 9-8: Select structural drawings showing the anticipated bridge repairs in 2012 (AMEC 2012)
Figure 9-9: Select structural drawings showing the anticipated bridge repairs in 2012 (AMEC 2012)
Figure 9-10: Select structural drawings showing the anticipated bridge repairs in 2012 (AMEC 2012)
9.3 Site Visit Photographs

Figure 9-11: View of bridge and deck, looking north.

Figure 9-12: Bridge pier and south entrance ramp, looking north.
Figure 9-13: Corrosion on support beams with repairs.

Figure 9-14: Deck and railing details, looking northwest.
Figure 9-15: South entrance ramp, looking west.

Figure 9-16: North ramp, looking east.
Figure 9-17: Southern pier and entrance ramp, looking south.

Figure 9-18: Structural joints and repairs on the south ramp.
Figure 9-19: South ramp, looking north.

Figure 9-20: Underside of bridge showing repairs, looking northeast.
### 10 Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>The Great Western Railway is constructed</td>
<td>Andreae 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>The railway is widened to include three tracks by 1923.</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Aerial photograph depicting Drury Lane</td>
<td>Hunting Survey Corporation 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Burlington City Council approves funding for pedestrian bridge over the railway at Drury Lane</td>
<td>Hamilton Spectator 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Drury Lane Pedestrian Bridge constructed</td>
<td>City of Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>CNR commuter service begins</td>
<td>Garcia and Bow 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>GO Transit takes over commuter service</td>
<td>Garcia and Bow 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Structural Modifications.</td>
<td>City of Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Wooden deck replaced with steel</td>
<td>City of Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Bridge Closed after inspection</td>
<td>City of Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Bridge Reopened after Major Refurbishment</td>
<td>City of Burlington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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