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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 Recommendation Report (CHERR) of the Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge, Mile 5.65 (Barrie 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 Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge was identified as a Conditional Heritage Property as part of the Cultural Heritage Screening Report completed for this Project. The Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge is located at Mile 5.65 of the Barrie rail corridor, and is owned by the City of Toronto. The overhead bridge carries pedestrian traffic over the rail corridor.

Part 1 of this CHER provides a description of this potential cultural heritage resource, including a summary of the 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 resource 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, John Sleath, Cultural Heritage Assistant, and Johanna Kelly, Cultural Heritage Assistant, all of 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 Recommendation Report (CHERR) of the Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge, Mile 5.65 (Barrie 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 Innes Avenue 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 Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge is located at Mile 5.65 of the Barrie rail corridor, and is located in the City of Toronto (Figure 1-1 and Figure 1-2). The bridge is a single-span, steel beam structure that carries pedestrian traffic in an east and west direction over one rail line. The bridge is located within one ownership parcel: PIN 21320-0989. The bridge is currently owned and maintained by the City of Toronto.

## 1.2 Historical Summary
The Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge is located in part of Lots 33 and 34, Concession III (West of Yonge Street) in the historic Township of York in the former County of York. The bridge is located southwest of the historic village of Fairbank, which developed at the corner of Dufferin Street and Eglinton Avenue West (See historical mapping in Section 9.0).

The Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge was built in 1991 to the designs and specifications of City of Toronto Planning and Development Department, Architecture and Urban Design Division. The date of any alterations or repairs is unknown. The subject bridge was constructed to replace and earlier wooden pedestrian bridge, constructed in 1956. A wooden structure is also noted on 1918 Topographical Mapping, suggesting this location has served as a bridging point for at least a century.

## 1.3 Current Context
The Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge is located on a small east-west road in the City of Toronto. The general area around the bridge is an established residential community consisting of single detached and semi-detached residences with established streetscapes.
Figure 1-1: Location of the Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge study area in the City of Toronto, Ontario (Open Street Map)

Figure 1-2: East entrance of the Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge
The properties adjacent to the bridge include: two detached residences to the northeast; a three storey apartment to the southeast; a semi detached residence to the northwest; and a semi detached residence to the southwest. All of these adjacent features appear to have been constructed more than 40 years ago.

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 Johanna Kelly, Cultural Heritage Assistant, on June 7, 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 Toronto Archives; 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 Toronto’s Inventory of Heritage Properties and list of Heritage Conservation Districts;

• 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
The City of Toronto Heritage Preservation Services was contacted by email to inquire about the heritage status of the resource as part of the Cultural Heritage Screening Report. Mary MacDonald at the City of Toronto was contacted in January 2016. The Innes Avenue 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 Toronto 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 Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge, which is owned by the City of Toronto, 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 Innes Avenue 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 Toronto, the Toronto Railway Historical Association, and the Toronto Historical Association were contacted to collect any information relating to the Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge (Table 6-1). No responses had been received 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 Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge.

<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>n/a</td>
<td>Toronto Railway Historical Association</td>
<td>255 Bremner Blvd, Unit 15</td>
<td>3 June 2016</td>
<td>No information received at the time of report writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Heritage Toronto</td>
<td>157 King Street East, 3rd Floor</td>
<td>3 June 2016</td>
<td>No information received at the time of report writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Toronto Historical Association</td>
<td>P.O. Box 67, 260 Adelaide St. E.</td>
<td>3 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**

*York Township*
The history of York Township as a territorial division began in 1791 when Augustus Jones surveyed the township. The first land patents were granted in 1796 and by 1813 all of the township lands had been
parcelled. By 1802, the township, bounded by the Humber River and Etobicoke Township to the west and sharing a border with Scarborough (alternately spelled Scarboro) Township to the east, had a grist mill, two saw mills and two taverns. In 1801, the combined population of York, Etobicoke and Scarborough Townships and the Town of York numbered only 678 but by 1840 the population of York Township numbered more than 5,000 and an economic boom during the 1850s helped to triple the population. The Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge study area is located in an area that did not experience the same dramatic growth and development in the mid-nineteenth century as the rest of the City of Toronto, as it was located a considerable distance north. The 1860 Tremaine’s Map (Figure 9-1) depicts the study area in a rural, agricultural setting, located on the Northern Railway tracks north of the small community of Carleton, on agricultural land owned by Gordon Silverthorn to the west and David White to the east.

Continued growth in the center of the city required the growing urban area to stretch its northern limits from Queen Street to Bloor Street. Outside of the core of the city, especially north along Yonge Street, Yorkville (above Bloor) was a prosperous village and some Torontonians settled between Bloor and Eglinton as new street railway services improved suburban to urban access.

The immediate vicinity of the Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge retained its rural, agricultural setting on the outskirts of the community of Carlton in the 1878 Illustrated Historical Atlas map (Figure 9-2). The study area is located between the farmsteads of Gilbert Thomas to the east, and Francis Silverthorn to the west.

A large number of suburban residences were constructed along the Davenport Ridge, an early Aboriginal trail. Villages in the township and their years of incorporation included Yorkville (1884) and North Toronto (Eglinton and Davisville combined 1889). The villages of Riverdale, Rosedale, the Annex, Seaton Village and Sunnyside were all annexed directly to Toronto during the 1880s. The annexation of East Toronto occurred in 1908.

The evolution of the city continued at an even greater pace through the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, with the consolidation of rail systems and the growth of numerous industrial and commercial operations within the city limits and along the rail corridors. The geographic area of the city doubled between 1891 and 1912, and the population grew from 181,000 to 378,000 during the same period.

The 1903 Fire Insurance Plan (Figure 9-3) shows the western portion of the study area retained an agricultural context, on land owned by E. Silverthorn. The eastern side of the study area however, is depicted as undergoing significant residential development from an area east of the rail line to Prospect Cemetery in the west, and from St. Clair Avenue in the south to Summit Avenue in the north. Innes Avenue, as well as several residential lots fronting on Innes Avenue are clearly depicted. No bridge, however, is noted to cross the rail line in the vicinity.
The 1923 Fire Insurance Plan (Figure 9-4) depicts the general study area as having undergone significant changes, with significant residential development to both the east and west of the rail line evident. All roadways present in the study area at the time of the field inspection are depicted in their present alignment, including Innes Avenue and Prescott Avenue. Overall, the study area is seen to have been removed from its agricultural setting in the early twentieth century in the face of continual urban expansion. A large lot with a large brick building is located to the northeast of the study area, in the present location of St. Nicholas of Bari Separate School, although it is not noted as being a school on the map. No bridge is noted to cross the rail line in the study area.

The 1954 aerial photograph (Figure 9-5) depicts the study area in a similar manner to the 1923 Fire Insurance Map, with the entire study area vicinity located in a residential setting. Prospect Cemetery is still evident to the east of the study area, as is a large non-residential lot to the immediate northeast of the study area (the present location of St. Nicholas of Bari Separate School). Although the replacement of the Innes Avenue footbridge over the rail line is mentioned in the City of Toronto Council Minutes on 10 September 1956 (City of Toronto Council Minutes, 1956: Volume 1, Item 512, page 222), no evidence of it is noted in the 1954 photograph due to low photo resolution. Aerial photography from 1947 depicts the former pedestrian bridge prior to replacement, in the approximate location of the 1956 bridge (City of Toronto Archives).

The 1992 aerial photograph of the City of Toronto (Figure 9-6) is the first in this series that depicts the extant bridge over the rail line, taken one year after its construction in 1991. This bridge continues to connect the residential areas east and west of the rail line, as the previous pedestrian bridges did. All extant roadways are located in their present alignment, and the study area continues to be depicted in a residential setting.

7.1.2 Significant Themes, Events and/or People

Railway Development

The first railway, the Ontario, Simcoe and Huron Railway (renamed the Northern Railway in 1858) opened from Toronto to Aurora, formerly Matchell’s Corners, in May of 1853. The line was expanded with service to Bradford beginning June 13, 1853, and further expanded to Barrie on October 11 1853. This expansion formed the path for the present Barrie Rail Corridor. The original 48 kilometre track was extended to Collingwood in 1856, to serve the port towns on Georgian Bay (Andreae 1997).

Originally incorporated in 1849 as the Toronto, Simcoe & Lake Huron Union Railroad Company (TSLHUR), the company was renamed the Ontario, Simcoe & Huron Union Railroad Company (OSHUR) in 1850, and finally the Northern Railway Company (NR) in 1858. The Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada (GTR) incorporated in 1855 and three years later absorbed the NR. By the 1880s, the Northern Railway had constructed four wharves along the edge of the track linking the Northern’s wharves to the
rest of its system. In 1920, control of the GTR was assumed by the Canadian Government and three years later, in 1923, the GTR was amalgamated with the Canadian National Railway (Andreae 1997).

The Barrie Corridor extends from downtown Toronto to the north towards Maple, continuing north through King City, Aurora, Newmarket, Bradford, and finally Barrie. This railway is associated with the first steam locomotive to operate in Ontario. The NR’s locomotive called Toronto, left the NR station at the southeast corner of Bay and Front Streets towards Aurora on May 16th, 1853 (Paterson & George 1988:14). Other notable pedestrian bridges in the City of Toronto include the Sunnyside Bridge and the Portland Street Pedestrian Bridge, however, these structures are located on the Lakeshore West, and Union Station Rail Corridor, respectively.

**Evolution as a Bridging Point**

An early twentieth-century wooden bridge was present in the same approximate location before 1918 based on a review of the 1918 Topographical Map (Department of Militia and Defence 1918), and a photograph found during archival research (City of Toronto Archives, Fonds 200, Series 372, Subseries 64, Item 55). A later wooden bridge was constructed in 1956 in the present location (City of Toronto Council Minutes, 1956, Volume 1, Item 512, pg. 222), but was removed when the extant steel bridge was constructed in 1991.

**W. Sefton and Associates Ltd, Consulting Engineers**

The Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge was designed by W. Sefton Associates Ltd., Consulting Engineers. This firm was also responsible for the design of the Cherry Street Bascule bridge, a steel lift bridge built over the canalized mouth of the Don River in the Portlands area of the City of Toronto in 1968. The Cherry Street Bascule Bridge was identified as a potential cultural heritage resource in a 2007 assessment as part of the Waterfront Toronto and TRCA EA project (Unterman McPhail Associates, Heritage Resource Management Consultants 2007).

### 7.2 Discussion of Design and Physical Value

#### 7.2.1 Physical Characteristics

The Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge is a single span, steel through truss structure with a closed deck protected with plastic roofing. The bridge measures 12.5 metres in length, and features a three-tiered spiraling oval ramp on the west side, and a two-tiered spiraling circular ramp on the east side. The west side ramp also features the Prescott Avenue Parkette, which includes decorative plantings and landscaping. Constructed in 1991, the bridge has not been subject to any major modifications or upgrades (Figure 9-1 to Figure 9-11 and Figure 9-12 to Figure 9-19).

The entrance ramps that allow access to the bridge are well laid out with a unique spiral pattern that eliminates the need for stairs and switchbacks, creating an unobstructed route that promotes consistent
pedestrian traffic flow. The west ramp leading to Prescott Avenue is integrated with the Prescott Avenue Parkette, which serves to enhance the quality of the aesthetic and design elements of the bridge, while increasing the amount of usable greenspace in the community. The east ramp leading to Innes Avenue features a decorative entranceway consisting of a stylized gabled pediment resting on pillars, to enhance the aesthetic appeal and reinforce the bridge’s role as a gateway within the community. The design and aesthetic elements of this structure and associated decorative plantings and landscaping enhance the experience of the users by adding natural elements, making it more in keeping with the larger residential context of the neighbourhood.

The subject bridge was constructed to replace an earlier wooden bridge constructed in 1956, which in turn was constructed to replace an early twentieth-century structure that is noted on the 1918 Topographical Map. The subject bridge is not known to have won any awards or to have received special recognition.

7.2.2 Comparative Analysis
The Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge is a single-span, steel bridge with a deck length of 41 metres.

The spiral ramp on the east side of the rail line is a relatively unique design in the City of Toronto, although it has been used successfully in many contexts around the world as a means of providing access to a bridge where there is limited space to construct a ramp. The inclusion of a spiral ramp, while relatively unique in the local context, does not exhibit any significant engineering or design value.

The subject bridge is the fourteenth longest pedestrian bridge spanning a Metrolinx Rail right-of-way, with the longest being the Sunnyside Pedestrian Bridge measuring 175 metres. The Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge is also the twelfth oldest pedestrian bridge, the oldest being the Wallace Avenue Pedestrian Overhead built in 1907.

7.3 Discussion of Contextual Value
7.3.1 Description of Setting and Character of the Property and Surroundings
The Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge is located in the Earlscourt neighbourhood of the City of Toronto, located northwest of the intersection of Caledonia Road and St. Clair West Avenue. The area is an established residential community composed of detached and semi-detached homes on either side of Innes Avenue, which is oriented east-west. 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 GO Barrie rail line, as well as Prospect Cemetery, located approximately 300 metres to the east, serve as boundaries to the community by limiting the transportation routes between this neighbourhood and the city at large.
7.3.2 Community Landmark
The inclusion of a bridge linking Prescott Avenue to the west and Innes Avenue to the east has been an important part of the community and local transportation routes since the early twentieth century. Since the first wooden bridge was replaced with a second wooden bridge in 1956, then later with the extant steel bridge in 1991, this crossing point has been maintained by the City of Toronto and used by local residents.
8 Data Sheet

Property Name: Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge (Mile 5.65)
Municipal Address: 43°40'49.79"N -79°27'34.20"W Datum WGS84
Municipality: City of Toronto
Metrolinx/GO Transit Rail Corridor: Barrie
PIN: 21320-0989
Ownership: City of Toronto
Date of Construction: 1991 (City of Toronto Council Minutes and Structural Drawings).
The extant structure replaces earlier bridges constructed in the early twentieth-century, and another constructed in 1956.

Date of Significant Alterations: Unknown
Architect/Designer/Builder: Designer: W. Sefton and Associates Ltd, Structural Engineers
Previous Owner(s)/Occupant(s): City of Toronto
Current Function: Pedestrian Bridge
Previous Function(s) Pedestrian Bridge
Heritage Recognition/Protection: None identified
Local Heritage Interest: None identified
Adjacent Lands: No protected heritage properties.
9 Figures

9.1 Historic Map Review

Figure 9-1: View of the study area on 1860 historic mapping (Tremaine 1860)

Figure 9-2: View of the study area on 1878 historic mapping (Miles & Co. 1878)
Figure 9-3: View of the study area on the 1903 Fire Insurance Plan (Goad 1903)

Figure 9-4: View of the study area on the 1923 Fire Insurance Plan (Goad 1923)
Figure 9-5: View of the study area on 1954 aerial photography (Hunting Survey Corporation 1954)

Figure 9-6: View of the study area on 1992 aerial photography (Toronto Archives 1992)
9.2 Select Structural Drawings

Figure 9-7: Select structural drawings showing the Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge Reconstruction (City of Toronto 1991)
Figure 9-8: Select structural drawings showing the Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge Reconstruction (City of Toronto 1991)
Figure 9-9: Select structural drawings showing the Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge Reconstruction (City of Toronto 1991)
Figure 9-10: Select structural drawings showing the Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge Reconstruction (City of Toronto 1991)
Figure 9-11: Select structural drawings showing the Innes Avenue Pedestrian Bridge Reconstruction (City of Toronto 1991)
9.3 Site Visit Photographs

Figure 9-12: East entrance ramp, looking west.

Figure 9-13: Bridge deck, looking west.
Figure 9-14: East spiral ramp, looking east.

Figure 9-15: West oval ramp, looking east.
Figure 9-16: South elevation and eastern ramp, looking west.

Figure 9-17: West entrance ramp, looking east.
Figure 9-18: South elevation, looking northeast.

Figure 9-19: North elevation, looking southeast.
10  Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>The Northern Railway is built and begins service.</td>
<td>Andreae 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Earliest map to show residential development in the immediate area.</td>
<td>Goad 1903</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>1991</td>
<td>Bridge constructed in current location linking Innes Avenue and Prescott Avenue.</td>
<td>City of Toronto Planning and Development Department, Architecture and Urban Design Division 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>The Northern Railway is built and begins service.</td>
<td>Andreae 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Earliest map to show residential development in the immediate area.</td>
<td>Goad 1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>CNR commuter service begins</td>
<td>Garcia and Bow 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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