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Executive Summary

Metrolinx retained AECOM to conduct a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge as part of the Lakeshore East Rail Corridor Expansion – Don River to Scarborough GO Station Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

Metrolinx is evaluating expanding and improving the Lakeshore East Rail Corridor between the Don River and Scarborough GO Station (Mile 332.50 to Mile 324.97) in the City of Toronto. The proposed works include:

- Addition of a fourth track on the south side between the Don River Bridge and Gerrard Street with the track shifting to the north side between Pape Avenue and Scarborough GO Station;
- Widening of bridges at: Woodbine Avenue, Warden Avenue and Danforth Avenue;
- Widening works under the Birchmount Road Bridge;
- Layout changes at Danforth GO Station;
- Retaining walls;
- Three culvert extensions: east of Coxwell Avenue (Mile 329.50), east of Kennedy Road (Mile 325.74) and Scarborough Junction (Mile 325.55).

This project will support service reliability and future service expansions as part of the transformational GO Expansion Program.

The project impacts will be assessed following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as prescribed in Ontario Regulation (O.Reg.) 231/08 under the Environmental Assessment Act. As part of the TPAP, an Environmental Project Report (EPR) will be prepared for public review.

A field review of the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge, located at Mile 330.96 (Map 1) was undertaken on April 5, 2016 by Emily Game, of AECOM.

The Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge consists (Figures 1 to 6) of a single span structure with ramps at the north and south ends. The north end of the bridge features a small connection between the bridge structure and the second floor of the Francis Beavis Manor, a Toronto Community Housing building. The piers and deck are constructed of reinforced concrete with a steel truss superstructure. The bridge crosses over the Lakeshore East Corridor between Gerrard Street East and Riverdale Avenue. The main structure was designed by Dillon Consulting Engineers and Planners for the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Department of Roads & Traffic. The connection between the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge and the Francis Beavis Manor was designed by Boigon and Armstrong. The bridge was designed to have an overall clearance of approximately 24 feet between the bridge and the rail corridor below.

The CHER was prepared by Michael Greguol, M.A., Cultural Heritage Specialist and Emily Game, B.A., Heritage Researcher with AECOM. Charlton Carscallen, M.A., Cultural Resources Technical Practices Manager acted as project lead.
1. Introduction

1.1 Historical Summary

The Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge is located between what was historically a part of Lot 12 and Lot 13, Concession I from the Bay, in the Township of York, York County. The Grand Trunk Railway (GTR) was constructed through the lots in the 1850s. In 1860, the lot had already been subdivided and four properties adjacent to the railway crossing at what would become Pape Avenue belonged to E.O, T. Doug, James Pape, presumably the individual identified in 1860 as simply J.P. and Taylor. By 1878 the four lots are owned by James Pape, James Farrell and George Cooper. At the time, all properties appear to be subdivided for residential purposes.

The GTR undertook an ambitious double-tracking program during the 1890s to twin their existing lines between Toronto and Montreal. The GTR became a part of the Canadian National (CN) in the 1920s. In June of 1925, CN began the Toronto Waterfront Grade Separation project, a massive undertaking which included the construction of a viaduct and several subways and bridges along the rail corridor. Metrolinx acquired a portion of the CN Kingston Subdivision in 2011, and the property continues to be maintained as an operating railway corridor.

1.2 Description of Property

The structure was designed in 1978 as a single span bridge and currently carries foot traffic over the Lakeshore East Rail Corridor (Map 1). The structure consists of reinforced concrete piers with pedestrian ramps on the north and south ends of the structure. A steel truss superstructure forms the main span of the bridge and spans a total of 130 feet over the rail corridor. The north end of the structure features a single span connection from the bridge to the second floor of Francis Beavis Manor (Figures 1 to 6). The bridge was designed to have an overall clearance of approximately 24 feet between the bridge and the rail corridor below.

1.3 Current Context

The character of Pape Avenue at the site of the bridge structure has developed as a commercial/industrial area with a current mix of uses. The areas immediately east and west of the structure are largely commercial, dominated by two shopping malls and a grocery store, while the areas north and south of the structure are residential. A small park, the “Matty Eckler Playground” is located south east of the structure at the south east intersection of Gerrard Street and Pape Avenue. Both streets serve as major traffic routes through this area of Toronto.
Map 1: Aerial Photograph Indicating the Location of the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge
Figure 1: View to the north of the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge (AECOM, 2016)

Figure 2: View of southern ramps on the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge (AECOM, 2016)
2. Methodology and Sources

2.1 Study Approach

This CHER was prepared in accordance with Metrolinx’s Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process (Fall 2013) and the MTCS Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010). The CHER was also undertaken according to the guidelines presented in the Metrolinx document, Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (February 2014) and outlined in the following tasks:

- Research and Documentation Gathering – gathered from various sources including existing heritage studies, Metrolinx records, public archives, and published materials;
- Writing – an illustrated report based on gathered background history and site investigation materials, and the application of Ontario Regulations 9/06 and 10/06;
- Evaluation, Recommendations, and Statement of Cultural Heritage Value – a summary of the applicable evaluation, and recommendations regarding whether the property meets criteria of being a provincial heritage property, a provincial heritage property of provincial significance, or neither.

As outlined in the Draft Terms of Reference (Metrolinx, February 2014), the heritage evaluation is to be separated into two stand-alone components: A CHER and a CHERR. The CHER includes the research conducted for respecting the bridge design and development and is aimed to address the criteria set out in O.Reg. 9/06 and 10/06. The CHERR includes the results of the applied evaluation, and the recommended outcome of the evaluation.

Emily Game, Heritage Researcher for AECOM conducted a site investigation to visually inspect and document the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge on April 5, 2016.

2.2 Secondary Sources

A series of secondary sources were reviewed for the purposes of data collection and analysis as a part of the CHER. The relevant guidelines and reference documents cited above served as a means of a framework for undertaking the study. The Cultural Heritage Screening Report for Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes – Lakeshore East Metrolinx Corridor Expansion (CHSR) prepared by AECOM in June 2016 provided a preliminary review of the rail corridor and the potential heritage properties identified along the corridor for the purposes of the study. Background information and applicable research was gathered from the report for the purposes of the CHER. In addition, a series of published materials including published histories pertaining to the history of Toronto, and railway development throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, were consulted for contextual purposes. A complete list of the sources reviewed for the report is contained in Section 14 (Bibliography).

2.3 Primary Sources

Where available, primary source material was consulted to provide a historic context for the evaluation of the potential heritage value of the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge. A review of the following primary sources aided in the evaluation of the bridge:

- Tremaine Map of the County of York;
- Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of York; and
- National Topographic Series Maps.

A complete list of the sources reviewed for the report is contained in Section 14 (Bibliography).
2.4 Consultations

As part of this CHER, AECOM undertook consultation with municipal and provincial staff in order to identify any existing heritage recognitions for the structure. The following individuals and organizations were consulted while undertaking this CHER:

- David I. Abernethy, Senior Associate, Petroff Partnership Architects / ARK (former Project Manager at Boigon & Armstrong: 1975 to 1991)
- Yasmina Shamji, Support Assistant, Heritage Preservation Services, City of Toronto;
- Jim Schaffner, Acting Manager, Structures and Expressways, City of Toronto
- Jeremy Collins, Acquisitions Coordinator; Ontario Heritage Trust; and
- Rob vonBitter, Archaeological Data Coordinator, Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport.

The results of the consultation efforts have been summarized in Section 6 (Community Input).
3. Heritage Recognitions

3.1 Municipal

As a review of applicable municipal heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties, AECOM reviewed the searchable *Inventory of Heritage Properties* administered by Heritage Preservation Services at the City of Toronto as well as existing Heritage Conservation Districts (HCD) within the City of Toronto, and HCDs currently under study within the city.

The Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge property was not included on the City’s *Inventory of Heritage Properties*. In addition, consultation with Yasmina Shamji, Support Assistant for Heritage Preservation Services, City of Toronto confirmed that the structure is not on the City’s Heritage Register and is not designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

3.2 Provincial

As a review of applicable provincial heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties AECOM reviewed the Ontario Heritage Trust’s (OHT) Provincial Plaque Guide, and list of OHT easements. The bridge is neither a subject of a provincial plaque or a provincial easement. In addition, OHT staff was contacted to review the Ontario Heritage Act Register to confirm that the bridge is not included on the register and that an OHT easement does not exist for the property.

Jeremy Collins, Acquisitions Coordinator with the Ontario Heritage Trust confirmed that the OHT did not have an entry relating to the bridge structure at Pape Avenue.

3.3 Federal

As a review of applicable federal heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties, AECOM reviewed the online searchable database for the Canadian Register of Historic Places as well as the Directory of Federal Heritage Designations. The Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge and the adjacent properties are not subject to any existing federal heritage recognitions.
4. **Adjacent Lands**

The properties adjacent to the railway corridor at Pape Avenue reflect a variety of land uses including residential, public parks, and commercial/industrial properties. The areas immediately east and west of the structure are largely commercial, dominated by a two shopping malls and a grocery store, while the areas north and south of the structure are residential. A small park, the “Matty Eckler Playground” is located south east of the structure at the south east intersection of Gerrard and Pape.

Properties adjacent to the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge are not subject to heritage recognitions at the municipal, provincial, or federal levels, or designations under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, municipal heritage listings, or heritage easements and/or commemorations.
5. **Archaeology**

Mapping on the City of Toronto’s Open Data website indicates that a small section of land north of Eastern Avenue Subway contain areas of archaeological potential (Map 5).

In addition, AECOM has completed a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (AA) for the project; refer to *Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Lakeshore East Rail Corridor Expansion, Don River to Scarborough GO Station (Segment 1), City of Toronto, Ontario (June 2016).*

The results of the Stage 1 AA indicate that, while the majority of the lands within the study area appear to have been disturbed by past development, there are portions which still retain archaeological potential. This is based on the presence of historic homesteads, the proximity of historic roads and railway, other archaeological sites and certain physiographic features in proximity the study area.

For lands within the study area that contain archaeological potential and will be impacted by the proposed Lakeshore East Rail Corridor Expansion - Don River to Scarborough GO Station Project, AECOM makes the following recommendations:

1) A Stage 2 AA should be conducted by a licensed consultant archaeologist using the test pit survey method at 5 m intervals in areas of archaeological potential.

2) Due to the potential for deeply buried intact archaeological resources on floodplains and beneath land alterations, Stage 2 AA will be required, following Section 2.1.7, Standard 2 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists.* Should test pitting by hand not reach subsoil (i.e. the area is found to have potential but it may be deeply buried), the survey methodology outlined in Section 2.1.7, Standard 3 or Guideline 2 for survey in deeply buried conditions must be adhered to.

3) Areas that are disturbed have been identified and require no further archaeological assessment.

4) The Stage 2 AA will follow the requirements set out in the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (MTCS 2011).

Refer to the Stage 1 AA for further details.
6. **Community Input**

As a part of the consultation process for this report, AECOM undertook consultation with Heritage Preservation Services at the City of Toronto, the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport, and the Ontario Heritage Trust. The results of the consultation efforts are identified below in Table 1.

**Table 1: Community Input and Consultation Undertaken for the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David I. Abernethy, Senior Associate, Petroff Partnership Architects / ARK (former Project Manager at Boigon &amp; Armstrong)</td>
<td>416-777-3530</td>
<td>June 13, 2016</td>
<td>Mr. Abernethy confirmed that the pedestrian bridge was designed primarily by Dillon Consulting Engineers and Planners for the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Department of Roads &amp; Traffic; Boigon and Armstrong did not design the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge. Boigon and Armstrong were responsible for the design of a small connection between the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge and the second floor of the Francis Beavis Manor, the community housing located north east of the bridge structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Collins, Acquisitions Coordinator</td>
<td>416-325-5017 <a href="mailto:crp@heritagetrust.on.ca">crp@heritagetrust.on.ca</a></td>
<td>May 27, 2016</td>
<td>The Ontario Heritage Trust does not have an Ontario Heritage Act entry relating to the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge, nor is the structure protected by an existing easement held by the Ontario Heritage Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Schnaffer, Acting Manager, Structures and Expressways, City of Toronto</td>
<td>416-392-8598</td>
<td>June 10, 2016</td>
<td>The City of Toronto has no information regarding the architect or builder of the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasmina Shamji, Support Assistant, Heritage Preservation Services, City of Toronto</td>
<td>416-392-1975 <a href="mailto:yshamji@toronto.ca">yshamji@toronto.ca</a></td>
<td>May 27, 2016</td>
<td>The Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge is not designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, and is not included on the City of Toronto’s Heritage Register. In addition, the City did not identify any further heritage concerns related to the structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob vonBitter, Archaeological Data Coordinator, Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robert.vonBitter@ontario.ca">Robert.vonBitter@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Janay 20, 2016</td>
<td>No archaeological assessments completed within 50 metres of study area; resulting in the identification of no archaeological sites. In addition, AECOM submitted a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment for the Project (Section 5).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Discussion of Historical or Associative Value

7.1 Historic Theme/Cultural Pattern

7.1.1 Transportation

The earliest roads in Ontario were typically military roads or colonization roads. These roads often followed Indigenous hunting trails or were dictated by the topography of the land which they crossed. The Dundas Road which was opened to connect Toronto with the Thames River, in what is now London, Ontario, and the Kingston Road, designed to provide a military link between Toronto and Kingston were some of the earliest and still functioning roads in southern Ontario.

Following the Crown surveys in Ontario, concession and side roads were opened on a grid that was dictated by the survey type that was used. The roads were cleared and made passable by the early land owners who built their dwellings adjacent to the concession roads. Despite being cleared, road conditions were often poor until the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Railway transportation – both passenger and freight – greatly improved the transportation network in Ontario beginning in the mid-1800s. The opening of the GTR between Montreal and Toronto in 1856 provided a link between the two cities and provinces that was more easily travelled in comparison to mid-19th century roads. The construction of the route from Montreal to Toronto, and then on to Sarnia by the end of the 1860s resulted in the construction of significant structures such as the Victoria Bridge over the St. Lawrence River, and the St. Clair Tunnel in Sarnia. The GTR was designed to enhance the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes shipping routes in response to the railroads and shipping networks in the United States. As a result it also strengthened the connection and link between the townships, and municipal and provincial economies in Ontario.

Various railway companies were formed in Ontario to create a vast network of rail lines that spread throughout the province by the early-20th century. Nonetheless, most of the companies were merged with or purchased by the CN or the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR). The GTR became a part of the CN network in 1923. In 2011, Metrolinx acquired a portion of the CN-owned Kingston Subdivision which included the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge.

7.2 Local History

The Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge is located within the City of Toronto, Ontario. Historically, the pedestrian bridge was located within the Township of York in the County of York. The subsections below include historic information related to the settlement and growth of these municipalities.

7.2.1 Settlement History

York County: York County is described in detail in the Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of York of 1878. Governor Simcoe had previously organized Upper Canada into nineteen counties, one of which was named York County. The County consisted of two ridings, east and west, bounded by Durham to the east, and the River Thames on the west. York was originally comprised of what are now the municipalities of York, Peel and Halton, as well as

---

Durham Region and the City of Toronto. By 1851 it had dramatically reduced in size as Wentworth, Halton, Ontario and Peel Counties had been separated from the County. Survey along the Lake began in 1791, with 11 Townships laid out between the River Trent and the head of the Bay of Quinte. In 1798, the County of York contained the Townships of Whitby, Pickering, Scarborough, York, Etobicoke, Markham, Vaughan, King, Whitby, Uxbridge, and Gwillimbury. The settlement of York began slowly, with no more than 12 houses built by 1795. In 1805, the Toronto Purchase was completed, with 250,880 acres transferred from the Mississauga’s for 10 shillings. Many of the first settlers were United Empire Loyalists, who were supplied with either a Town lot or 200 acres. In 1794, a number of German families moved to York from New York City. By 1830, the population had grown significantly, to 17,025, and York was incorporated as the city of Toronto in 1834.

**The Township of York:** The Township of York was first surveyed in 1791 by Augustus Jones, at which time it was referred to as “Dublin”\(^2\). At this time, all the surveying had accomplished was to run lines dividing the Townships. The name was soon changed to “York” and is referred to as such in a document from 1793. This document also suggests the Township was briefly named “Toronto” before its final change\(^3\). Messrs Aitken and Jones further surveyed York in 1793, although they did not finish. The Township was not fully surveyed until 1829 when the work was completed by Sir Samuel Street Wilmont\(^4\).

The population for the Township of York in 1798 was recorded in combination with the Home District, the Town of York, Etobicoke and Scarborough, for a total population of 749\(^5\). By 1820 the Township of York’s population had risen to 1,672, in 1825 it jumped to 2,412, and 5,720 inhabitants were recorded in 1842\(^6\). The 1881 census listed the population at 13,748; more than double its size of four decades earlier.

Early notable communities within York Township included Elia, Seaton Village, Parkdale, Willowdale, Newtonbrook, York Mills, Eglinton and Davisville. The first village in the Township of York to be incorporated was Yorkville in 1884, followed by North Toronto in 1889. Riverdale, Rosedale, the Annex, Seaton Village and Sunnyside followed and were annexed directly to Toronto in the 1880s.

**1880s to the First World War:** The streets on the east side of the Don River were some of the earliest streets developed in Toronto, this development stretched from the mid-1880s to the First World War. The houses in the vicinity of the rail corridor are a combination of Second Empire row houses, “Bay-n-Gable” style and examples of Edwardian foursquare. The development of the study area in Victorian and Edwardian periods occurred on a relatively small scale, with local builders or contractors constructing variations on established architectural styles.

### 7.2.2 Site History

In the 1860s the properties that the GTR cut across in the southern part of York Township were a mixture of residential and industrial properties. The 1860 *Tremaine’s Map of the County of York* indicates that the lots had already been subdivided; and four small lots were privately owned on the east and west side of what is now Pape Avenue. Approximately 20 years later, in 1878, the lot is depicted in the *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of York* as belonging James Pape, James Farrell and George Cooper to James Pape, James Farrell and George Cooper (Map 4). On both maps, the lot, and surrounding lots to the north of the pedestrian bridge appear to have been used primarily for residential purposes.

Prior to 1978, Pape Avenue was an at-grade vehicular crossing. In 1978, the level crossing was closed and the current bridge constructed.

---

4. *Ibid*.
5. Adam and Mulvany, *op. cit.* (1885), p.79.
7.3 Person/Event/Organization

7.3.1 Grand Trunk Railway

The GTR was created in the 1850s to build a railway line between Toronto and Montreal. The route was opened in 1856 and opened further west to Sarnia by the end of the 1850s. Specifically, a GTR line cut across the southern portion of York Township by 1850s. The line, as depicted on the 1860 Tremaine Map, and the 1877 map shown in the *Illustrated Atlas of the County of York* follows the shoreline and cuts north to avoid Frenchman's Bay, similar to the Kingston Road. The original line would have included a level-crossing of Pape Avenue. The expansion of the GTR across Ontario was meant to offer competition to the United States' shipping network.

During the late-19th century the GTR undertook an aggressive double-tracking program to double its service between Toronto and Montreal. By the early-20th century, the GTR had expanded its service through a series of mergers and partnerships with other lines, however, in 1923 the newly formed, and publically-owned CN absorbed the GTR through a reorganization of the company. The CN had assumed operation and management of the line between Toronto and Montreal including its structures such as bridges and culverts, which were maintained throughout the 20th century. In 2011, Metrolinx acquired the Kingston subdivision of the original route.

8. Discussion of Design or Physical Value

8.1 Style/Type/Tradition

The structure is designed as a single span bridge and carries foot traffic over the Lakeshore East Rail Corridor. The original design of the structure consisted of reinforced concrete approach ramps on the north and south ends of the structure, each supported with four reinforced concrete piers (Figure 1). The north end of the bridge features a small connection between the bridge structure and the second floor of the Francis Beavis Manor, a Toronto Community Housing building (Figures 5 and 6). A steel superstructure constructed with a Hollow structural section (HSS), forms the main span of the bridge and spans a total of 130 feet over the rail corridor. Light standards located at the north and south ends of the bridge and light fixtures are attached to the top chords (Figure 4).

The design and configuration of the extant is pedestrian bridge is largely similar to the 1978 original plan with the exception of following elements. The current light standards at the north and south ends of the structure differ from those in the original plans. The drawing shows a typical standard for the 1970s; it is unclear if the current standards are an architectural extra or a later re-fit. The original plans show an open truss system, while the current pedestrian walkway is covered with a protective canopy made of acrylic sheets, reinforced with steel, a chain link fence extends from the concrete deck to the top chords.

The design of the pedestrian bridge follows standard practice of mid- to late-20th century bridge engineering.

8.2 Function

The structure has always functioned as a railway structure since its construction in 1978. Prior to the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge, the GTR, later CN tracks crossed Pape Avenue at a level crossing. This crossing was eliminated when Pape Avenue was closed at that point and became a discontinuous street. The Pedestrian Bridge is now the only access across the tracks at Pape Avenue.

8.3 Fabric

The pedestrian bridge consists of both concrete and steel, both common construction materials for railway structures in the 1970s. The substructure is constructed on reinforced concrete. At the turn of the 20th century, most railway
structure abutments and piers were built of concrete as opposed to the earlier masonry structures. Railway structures constructed completely of concrete were not used much in Canada until the 1930s, despite being popular for highway construction.

The steel superstructure of the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge was a common building material and element used extensively throughout the late-19th and early-20th centuries. Despite the introduction of structures built entirely of concrete, steel girders were used well into the 20th century and can be found as part of modern railway structures today.
9. Discussion of Contextual Value

9.1 Social Meaning

The Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge is one of many structures over a rail corridor and has no contextual value. The Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge is a modern pedestrian bridge that crosses the railway corridor. Similar pedestrian railways are found elsewhere on the corridor.

9.2 Environment

The Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge does not contribute to the general character or cultural value of the surrounding environment.

9.3 Formal Recognition

The Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge is not formally recognized at the municipal, provincial, or federal level. The City of Toronto confirmed that the structure is not located within and Heritage Conservation Districts or Heritage Conservation District study areas.
## 10. Data Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>PROPERTY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Address</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrolinx/GO Transit Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Lakeshore East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Lat/Long:                                  | Lat: 43.669207°  
|                                           | Long: -79.340868°                                 |
| PIN                                        | N/A                                               |
| Ownership                                  | Metrolinx / City of Toronto                        |
| Exterior, street view photo                |                                                   |
| Aerial photo showing property boundaries   |                                                   |
| Date of Construction/source                | Constructed in 1978                               |
| Date of significant alterations/source     | Unknown                                           |
| Architect/designer/builder/source          | Dillon Consulting Engineers and Planners for the  |
|                                           | Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Department of |
|                                           | Roads & Traffic; , minor details by Boigon and    |
|                                           | Armstrong, Architects                             |
| Previous owner(s) and/or occupants         | None identified                                   |
| Current function                           | Pedestrian Overpass                               |
| Previous functions, if other(s)            | None identified                                   |
| Heritage Recognition (municipal, provincial, federal, HSMBC) | None identified                                      |
| Local Heritage interest                    | None identified                                   |
| Adjacent lands                             | No protected heritage properties                   |
11. Figures

Figure 3: View to north east of the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge (AECOM, 2016)

Figure 4: Detail of Warren truss system and reinforced concrete deck (AECOM, 2016)
Figure 5: View to northeast from the deck of the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge towards Francis Beavis Manor (AECOM, 2016)

Figure 6: Single span connection between the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge and the second floor of the Francis Beavis Manor (AECOM, 2016)
12. Maps

Map 2: Location of the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge
Map 3: Location of the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge on the 1860 Historic Atlas Map (Tremaine, 1860)
Map 4: Location of the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge on the 1878 Historic Atlas Map (Miles & Co., 1878)
13. **Chronology**

The following indicates milestone dates, periods, and events in the structural evolution of the Pape Avenue Pedestrian Bridge and its surrounding environment:

- **1791** The Township of York was first surveyed in 1791 by Augustus Jones, at which time it was referred to as “Dublin”. At this time, all the surveying had accomplished was to run lines dividing the Townships. With the undertaking of the Crown Survey, Lot 11, Concession A was formed.

- **1850s** Grand Trunk Railway was established and construction of a line between Toronto and Montreal took place.

- **1890s** Grand Trunk Railway undertakes ambitious double tracking program to construct a second line between Toronto and Montreal. As a result several new structures – bridges and culverts – along the corridor are significantly upgraded or completely reconstructed.

- **1923** The Grand Trunk Railway becomes a part of the Canadian National Railway and as a result the rail corridor and its assets are transferred to CN.

- **1978** Vehicular traffic on Pape Avenue is discontinued through the at-grade crossing, replaced with the current pedestrian bridge.

- **2011** Metrolinx acquires Kingston Subdivision from CN.

---

7 Adam and Mulvany, *op. cit.* (1885), p. 77.
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